THE BUDGET,

A COLLECTION of LETTERS,

IN FAVOUR OF

PUBLIC LIBERTY.

Publiſhed in the Interval of 1764 to 1770.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WALKER, Paternoſter-Row.

M.DCC.LXXXIX.

BODLEIAN
11 APR 1946
LIBRARY

A

COLLECTION

OF

Letters and Eſſays, &c.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Oct.* 6, 1764.

SIR,

IT has been computed that the whole eccleſiaſtical revenue in this kingdom, (including the revenue of the two univerſities) amounts to more than three millions annually. A ſum ſufficient to afford a comfortable ſubſiſtence for the clergy, upon two ſuppoſitions, 1ſt, That it be properly diſtributed, and, 2d, That the clergy confine themſelves to the duties of their calling. A pious, learned, and laborious miniſter of the goſpel, will neither ſeek nor deſire many ſuperfluities. Moderation is a part of his character; and if a numerous family or the nature and extent of a particular clergyman's ſtudies, ſhould call for more expence than ordinary, *that* too might be ſupplied out of this *enormous* Sum, without leaving thoſe who have no ſuch occaſions or neceſſities in any want. Manifold

experience ſhews, that where the clergy are indulged beyond theſe neceſſary demands, the ſurplus is too commonly employed in a Manner not only obſtructive of the edification propoſed by the miniſterial calling, but productive of ſcandal to religion itſelf. It hath likewiſe evil effects in the civil government, eſpecially in ſuch eſtabliſhments as our own. Affluence tempts the clergy to aſpire to provinces foreign to their original deſignation, to combine and ſet up claims to rights and privileges independent of the civil power, and to make uſe of religion as a political engine, to be played and worked by themſelves alone. That I may not be thought to be deſcribing a popiſh rather than a proteſtant clergy, I muſt beg leave to cite a paſſage from a book printed in the year 1754, and reprinted more lately, entitled, *A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philoſophy*, p. 4, 5. "He [Lord "Bolingbroke] indeed, ſaith this writer, may call "for the aid of the ſecular arm; but I dare ſay "the clergy never will. *Things are now come to "that paſs*, that the ſtate ſeems to be in more "need of their ſupport, than they of the ſtate's." This is ſpeaking pretty plainly, Mr. Baldwin, and diſcovering, without much diſguiſe, how deſirous at leaſt the clergy are of being conſidered as pillars of the State. One would think however that the clergy are in one reſpect at leaſt beholden to the ſecular arm, namely, to aſcertain and ſecure their temporal rights and poſſeſſions. But let us hear how this ſtrange writer explains himſelf: "For "tho' the cavils of licentious men, adds he, al-"ways end in the confirmation of truth and virtue, "yet they generally ſet out in looſening the "hold which religion has on the people. And

when

" when that is gone, what *other engine* the ma-
" giſtrate will invent to keep the multitude in
" order, they whoſe principal concern it is, would
" do well to conſider." Here religion is conſidered as a mere ſtate-engine to keep the multitude in order; and the clergy, as the ſole engineers, with ſomething very like a menace, that if they, whoſe concern it is, do not lean upon this ſupport, they will be left to the inefficiency of their other engines, without any aid or aſſiſtance from that of the clergy. Well then, what is the alternative? Why, that if ſtateſmen will behave as they ought to the clergy, the clergy, in their turn, will accommodate *their* engine to the uſes of the ſtateſmen: namely, by teaching the multitude the *religious* duties of paſſive obedience, and non-reſiſtance, and inculcating the divine right of magiſtrates to rule the people according to their own arbitrary will and pleaſure: Which is exactly the ſame bargain that his holineſs of Rome makes with all princes and potentates within the catholic pale. I appeal to the common ſenſe even of ordinary readers, whether this curious paragraph is capable of any other conſtruction? For that ſort of religion which lays the faſteſt hold of the people, is that undoubtedly which is implanted in the reaſonable minds of individuals, and which, where it is the moſt prevalent, receives, I am afraid, but a very accidental ſort of aſſiſtance from the inſtruction and example of the clergy: A religion intended, by the bleſſed author of it, rather for the government of ſubjects of a kingdom which is not of this world, than to order unruly multitudes by the ſenſible terrors and penalties of earthly

ordinances. As the book from whence this paſſage is taken, appeared without the name of its author, I have no right to give him one. There are pretty plain internal proofs, that it is not the work of a layman, but more probably of one who having *waxen fat* upon the church-paſture, is diſpoſed to *kick* under the leaſt confinement of ſtate engines, even thoſe of the moſt wholeſome and ſalutary civil laws. But be he who he will, if he is an authoriſed advocate for the clergy, it is time, Mr Baldwin, to look about us, and to take care that ſuch a body of men, be circumſcribed within their proper limits; and inſtead of permitting them to apply ſuch a fund, as the queen's bounty, to the ambitious purpoſes of a political ſociety, to confine them to their preſent millions, and to ſee firſt of all that theſe are duly portioned out according to the labours and deſervings of particular miniſters, after which, I will venture to ſay, that, not only all reaſonable complaint of an inſufficient proviſion for the inferior clergy would be effectually ſuperſeded, but the cauſe of truth and virtue more eſſentially maintained, and the *cavils of licentious men* in a great meaſure obviated in that article particularly, which at preſent, perhaps, gives them their greateſt ſtrength and advantage, viz. The principles, diſpoſitions, and conduct of a great part of the eſtabliſhed clergy.

Yours, &c. PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 1, 1764.

A WRITER, in your Chronicle, of October 6, who calls himſelf Verus Amicus Eccleſiæ (he ſhould have added Romanæ) aſks a ſhrewd queſtion, viz. "Whether country pariſhes, in ſome of which "clergymen do not reſide, or populous towns "and cities, where numbers of clergy are conſtant "reſident, are moſt peſtered with ſectaries (mean-"ing proteſtant diſſenters) of every denomination? "And, he ſays, the anſwer will be, the latter." I believe he is in the right; and the probable reaſon of this is, that ſerious chriſtians are ſhocked and ſcandalized to ſee the clergy in cities and great towns, reſorting to luxurious feaſts, balls, concerts, carding parties, and other idle and profane feſtivities, without any ſcruple; and therefore chuſe to receive their edification from thoſe, whoſe more ſober deportment is in better agreement with the profeſſion of a pure and undefiled religion. And, perhaps, the diſſenters may, properly enough, be ſtiled to *peſter* the clergy by their remarks upon practices ſo incongruent with the duty of chriſtian Paſtors. The ſame cenſures, however, are paſſed by ſober and judicious members of the eſtabliſhed church as well as by diſſenters. Poſſibly Verus Amicus may think, that he hath obviated ſuch remarks, by inſinuating (as he does in the caſe of the clerks of the turf) that *the preſence of the clergy may contribute to keep up decorum, and prevent exceſſes and indecencies among the lay brethren*

and ſiſters aſſembled on theſe joyous occaſions. If this is the ordinary effect of the clergy's mixing in ſuch company, what a pity it is that the city of Bath did not, on a late vacancy, chuſe ſome right Rev. Prelate for the maſter of their revels! But I am afraid this is an hypotheſis contrary to fact; and that it is much more common to ſee the clergy ſecularized by ſuch company, than to find the laity ſanctified by ſuch of the clergy as aſſociate with them on theſe occaſions. But any thing will go down with *Verus Amicus*, except ſectaries, and theſe it ſeems, to his comfort, "are upon the "decline, at leaſt in moſt country towns and "pariſhes in the kingdom." Probably, becauſe ſeeing the pariſh miniſter, or his occaſional curate, only on Sundays, they have no opportunity of knowing how he ſpends his time in the city or great town where he reſides the reſt of the week. *Verus Amicus*, indeed, gives another reaſon, namely, "that a great part of the court ſun-"ſhine vouchſafed to ſectaries in former times, "is withdrawn by the adminiſtration." Now I am of opinion, that there is not one hearty friend to the religious and civil liberties of Great Britain, who does not think that the toleration, eaſe, and encouragement given to proteſtant diſſenters ſince the revolution, is one of the wiſeſt, as well as moſt righteous meaſures of our legiſlature recorded in hiſtory. Who have been faſter friends to the ſucceſſion in the proteſtant and ever-to-be-honoured Houſe of Hanover, than proteſtant diſſenters of all denominations? Who have been more ſteady in their affections to, or more forward to ſupport the cauſe of theſe illuſtrious princes, than pro-

teſtant

teſtant diſſenters? What then muſt the warm-hearted proteſtant Engliſhman think of an adminiſtration, who (as this injudicious zealot repreſents them, I hope without the leaſt colour of reaſon) are mortifying and diſcouraging a ſet of men, whoſe inviolable fidelity and affection to his Majeſty's perſon and government, may be depended upon in the moſt trying emergencies, and, what is more, to whom his Majeſty hath expreſsly vouchſafed to grant his royal protection? But all this while, what has this true friend of the church to ſay concerning the papiſts, who ſwarm among us? Not a ſingle word. I dare ſay, they are his faſt friends. And yet I will venture to affirm, becauſe I think it may be proved, that for one proteſtant diſſenter who declines from his ſect, even in this abſence of adminiſtration ſun-ſhine, there are ten gained over to popery from the church of England. And what wonder, when popiſh prieſts and jeſuits ſwarm as they do in every corner of the kingdom, and when we are told from the preſs, by ſomebody who pretends to know, that *popiſh Biſhops go about here, and exerciſe every part of their function, without offence, and without obſervation.* Some ſenſible writers, Mr Baldwin, in your Chronicle, have expreſſed their Surprize at the patience of our political and ſpiritual watchmen, where the public has ſo preſſing a demand for their vigilance and activity. I ſhall not pretend to account for it, but only expreſs my hope, that the ſun-ſhine, ſaid, by *Verus Amicus*, to be withdrawn from the innocent and deſerving Proteſtant diſſenters, will never be transferred to theſe vipers in the bowels of our conſtitution, who,

if they ſhould ever become the majority, would *preſſ* the public in a very different manner from any practiſed by other ſectaries, even when they were at the ſummit of their power.

I am, Sir, *&c.* LAICUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 6, 1764.

AS you favoured a few remarks of mine on Queen Anne's bounty, and ſome other eccleſiaſtical matters (well worthy of the attention of the public) with a place in your Chronicle, I am tempted to venture a few more with you of the ſame nature and tendency. It is very well known that many livings, which are diſcharged from the payment of tenths and firſt-fruits, are now, by repeated augmentations, riſen to a greater value than many laborious cures which are ſtill burthened with thoſe payments. The charging and diſcharging livings, at the time when the Bounty took place, were undoubtedly regulated by ſome accounts which might be depended upon, the beſt at leaſt which could then be procured. But as the curators of the bounty have had ſufficient time to correct all miſtakes, and to perceive the preſent inequality in the diſtribution, as well as ſome groſs miſapplications of it, the public have had reaſon to expect, that they would have applied to parliament, for ſuch additional Powers, as might enable them to make ſuch new regulations, as the preſent ſtate of ſmaller livings ſeems to demand. Why they have not done this,

is

is a myſtery for which there is no accounting, but by ſuppoſing, that an examination into the ſtate and management of that fund, might have given an hint to the lovers of Britiſh liberty, and have put them upon diverting ſome part of what accrues from it, into ſome other channel. In the mean while, the complaints and clamours of the Hardſhips of the inferior clergy are continued, liſtened to, and believed, as if it was a general grievance all over the kingdom. But not a word is ſaid of what ſort of men the inferior clergy conſiſts, with reſpect to morals, piety, and learning. Let this be the firſt enquiry, and I will venture to ſay, the deſerving candidates for theſe augmented ſtipends will not be a majority. I know ſeveral of them remarkable for nothing but their ignorance and their vices, who are the Plagues and ſcandals of the neighbourhood where they live, and, by the means of the bounty, ſettled upon the unhappy pariſhioners for life; when, otherwiſe it might have been hoped, that their ſcanty proviſions would either have bound them to better behaviour, or have driven them to ſeek a more plentiful ſubſiſtence elſewhere. I wiſh I could ſay of my own knowledge, that the ſuperior clergy are more exemplary or meritorious upon the whole. But upon telling noſes in my neighbourhood, I cannot help aſſenting to the opinion of the late Dr Newton of Oxford, viz. "That if liſts "of pluraliſts were annually publiſhed, it would "appear that an act of parliament againſt plu-"ralities would not diſcourage learning," to which I will add, piety, and a conſcientious diligence in the miniſterial calling. The late excellent Biſhop

Fleetwood, in a certain preface, well known by its fate, expreſſed ſome fore-bodings, that in caſe of certain accidents, "theſe nations might, ſome "time or other, fall into the way of all other na- "tions, and loſe their liberty:" And he more than inſinuates, that a great deal of the dreadful miſchief would be laid to the charge of the men of his own order, who by propagating principles, and aſpiring to powers, inconſiſtent with the laws and conſtitutions of this country, as well as unwarranted by the chriſtian religion, would pave the way to the eſtabliſhment of deſpotiſm, where their uſefulneſs could not be ſpared. Should ſuch a claſs of men be truſted with the entire diſpoſal of an accumulating fund, for which they are at preſent accountable to nobody? Surely not. For whatever may be the pious and generous diſpoſitions of our preſent great church-men; whatever their humility, and averſion to titles, ample revenues, and tranſlations to revenues ſtill more ample; whatever may be their moderation with reſpect to chriſtian liberty; whatever readineſs they may ſhew to depart ſtill farther from Rome, by endeavouring to explode the particulars in our public ſervices which appear ſo much like popery; whatever of theſe excellencies I ſay, may appear in our preſent leading clergy, a new ſucceſſion may be differently diſpoſed, and, for their own ſakes, lend their hands to bring about a change, in which they might be able to make a ſtate bargain for their own independence. Whatever may be pretended by virtue of a chimærical alliance between church and ſtate (the records of which may be ſought for with equal ſucceſs in the wilds

of

of America, as in regiſtries of the Britiſh conſtitution) the Intereſts and claims of the clergy are really as diſtinct from thoſe of the body of the people, as the faſhion of their habits. On which account nothing is more incumbent on the true patriot, than to take care that no temptations to tyranny and oppreſſion be laid in the way of a ſet of men, of whom all future generations will have reaſon to be aware as long as any monuments ſhall remain of the ſhocking abuſes of prelatical power in the church of Rome, to ſay nothing of other churches, where the like form of government has been eſtabliſhed and exerciſed.

I am, Sir, *Yours, &c.* PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 29, 1764.

A Learned author, ſpeaking, in the preface to a celebrated work, of the corruption of the times about twenty years ago, has the following remark: "The only ſymptom not mortal in "our ſickneſs is, that we have not yet abuſed "our phyſician. Amidſt that unbridled licence, "which now inſults every thing in government "and religion, it is ſome conſolation to every "good man to ſee the two univerſities ſecure from "*Outrage.*" The learned man however gives us to underſtand, in a note ſubjoined, "that this "outrage, (though unknown to him when he firſt "publiſhed this crumb of comfort) was actually "begun againſt Oxford, by an imputation of her "tolerating *methodiſm.*" Whether Oxford has

not ſince been *outraged* by imputations of a leſs innocent complexion than *methodiſm*, I liſt not to inquire. My preſent complaint is on the behalf of the ſiſter-univerſity of Cambridge, to whoſe turn, it ſeems, it is now come to be *outraged*, and I am afraid, without the luck of finding an advocate of equal dignity and importance with this eminent patron of the *other eye of* England. I hope, however, Mr Baldwin, I may be indulged with offering a word or two in defence of my old *Alma-Mater*, who even now affords me all the ſubſiſtence I have in the world. Thus, then, I ſtate our deplorable caſe. Phyſicians (as well as many other good things) may be *abuſed* two ways. Firſt, by bribing, or unduly influencing them to miſapply their talent to wicked purpoſes, ſuch as procuring abortion, adminiſtring poiſon, &c. And ſecondly, by calling them naughty names, diſparaging their ſkill, and mal-treating their perſons, when they have the courage or the honeſty to reſiſt the temptation. If you liſten to the clamour of parties, you muſt believe that we have *abuſed phyſicians* among us in both theſe ſenſes. On the one hand we are called a mercenary, corrupt ſet of wretches, each of whom would ſell the moſt valuable of our academical rights and privileges for his own private emolument. Turn to the other ſide, and you hear of nothing but of a ſet of factious ſcoundrels, oppoſing and inſulting government, and inſtilling the principles of ſedition into the riſing generation who have the misfortune to be educated among us. Now, Mr Baldwin, I will undertake to ſay, that theſe are incompatible accuſations, and that, generally ſpeaking, *faction* and *corruption* are never

to

to be found together in the ſame community. For Inſtance: Upright and incorrupt men, in ſtations of ſuperiority, are uniformly employed, in promoting peace, order, virtue, religion, and unſpotted morality, and in cultivating the generous principles of public liberty, civil and religious. And whoever ſhould riſe in oppoſition to ſuch characters, would be, without all queſtion, factious and ſeditious members of the body, whether politic or academic. On the other hand, corruption is ever employed in a bad cauſe, and to bring about evil purpoſes; conſequently the party, counteracting it, ought never to be called a *faction*, but a righteous oppoſition to ruinous and iniquitous meaſures. Now the queſtion is, which of theſe *outrages* is moſt evidently exemplified in the preſent commotions of our univerſity? The learned and eminent perſon above cited, purſuing his reflection on the ſuppoſed academical ſecurity already mentioned, tells us, that in the decline of the Athenian glory, it was "the want of public ſpirit in the "rulers, that raiſed a licentious one in thoſe "who ſhould obey." Whether the licentious ſpirit (if ſo it muſt be called) among us, aroſe from this, or from ſome other cauſes, will beſt be determined by facts, and I apprehend there may be ſome ſufficiently notorious in our caſe to decide the queſtion with the utmoſt preciſion. I beg leave to refer to one, which I have often heard mentioned by the friends of L— H—— in a late conteſt. One of the moſt obvious tokens of the want of public ſpirit, is *partiality*. "Now, ſay theſe "*licentious* men, it was evident not only to this "univerſity, but to the whole nation, that, notwith-

" withstanding the equal regard shewn us by our " gracious sovereign, not only a portion of *mini-* " *sterial* sun-shine was withdrawn from us, and " diffused upon the sister-university, but that the " whole was intercepted from us, by a thick im- " penetrable cloud in that quarter. We must there- " fore have been lost to all sensibility to suffer a " person to be thrust into one of our principal " offices, who was in league with the accessaries " to this unmerited distinction; and who could " have no other view in aspiring to it, than our " farther humiliation." As this *faction* appeal thus to the whole nation, it is not my business to ascertain the fact; but the fact being once established, the conduct of the party who plead it, is even upon the principles of the celebrated author, whose tender regard for the freedom and security of our universities appears above, not only justifiable, but even highly commendable,—the conduct of prudent, sensible, public spirited men—the conduct, in a word, of men of *unblemished integrity, amidst a very general corruption.* I am,

Sir, *Yours, &c.*

Apothecarius Cantabrigiensis.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 4, 1764.

I Cannot but felicitate the protestants of Saxony upon the late exclusion of their Elector from the crown of Poland, especially considering the calamities brought upon their country during the reigns

of

of the two laſt Electors who wore it, and who, for the ſake of wearing it, renounced the proteſtant, and embraced the popiſh faith. Saxony was the firſt principality in Europe, which, as a ſtate, profeſſed the proteſtant religion, and, under the auſpicious government of Frederick III. gave protection to the learned and magnanimous Luther, the undaunted aſſertor of the evangelical religion, in ſpite of the terrors and artifices of Rome, ſupported by the authority and menaces of the emperor Charles V. It is well known how much and how juſtly the Saxon proteſtants value themſelves upon this event to this day, eſteeming it the moſt diſtinguiſhing honour of their country, and which, in fact, ten ſucceeding Electors, after Frederick III. ſteadily maintained and aſſerted, as well by their own zealous profeſſion of the proteſtant faith, as by totally diſallowing the public exerciſe of popery within their juriſdiction. How ſadly then may we ſuppoſe were the poor Saxons mortified to find theſe two princes deſerting the cauſe of religious truth and liberty, thro' a motive from which their country could not propoſe to derive any advantage! But this was not the worſt: For though Frederick Auguſtus I. had made ſo conſiderable a ſacrifice to conciliate the Poles, yet could he never ſatisfy them of the ſincerity of his converſion, otherwiſe than by introducing popery into his Saxon dominions, under ſuch a toleration as left it free to ſtruggle with the Lutheran eſtabliſhment for the victory. And it ſhould ſeem, by ſome ſtipulations propoſed by the papiſts in Poland during the late vacancy of the throne, that the government of the late King had not totally laid this jealouſy aſleep, though

he

he had given much more early and ſanguine proofs of his catholiciſm than his father had done. The reſult of the above-mentioned ſtruggle of the two religions in Saxony was, that ſome proteſtants were not permitted to have a public church at Dreſden, the capital city, nor to have the privilege of citizens, till the acceſſion of the preſent Elector, who, it is to be hoped, warned by the fortune of his two predeceſſors, and animated by the example of his and their noble anceſtors, will proceed to ſhake off the whole popiſh yoke, and once more expel the many headed monſter which alone has brought ſo many evils on his hereditary dominions. This at leaſt, permit us, Mr Baldwin, to wiſh and pray for, on account of our brother proteſtants in that Electorate, and the edification of ſome others who ſeem to be amazingly inattentive, at this critical ſeaſon, to the ſpirit and genius, and even the open efforts of that baſe and barbarous ſuperſtition. Should a wicked tory miniſtry attempt, in any future time, to enſlave us by whatever meaſures, if they ſhould ever be obliged to avow and juſtify them, it muſt be upon popiſh principles. True proteſtant principles will never ſcreen or countenance arbitrary rule: And that is the true reaſon why popery found ſo much encouragement among the Stuarts and their worſhippers in the laſt generation. And it may be laid down as an indubitable rule, that whenever the progreſs of popery is connived at in a proteſtant ſtate, whenever the importation of maſs prieſts and jeſuits gives no alarm, and they are ſuffered to make proſelytes at their eaſe, and in defiance of penal laws, then may we juſtly ſuſpect that the prevailing policy

licy of the miniſter in ſuch a ſtate is, by no means, favourable to the liberties of a free people, as nothing will ſo ſpeedily and effectually diſpoſe them to wear with patience the chains that may be forging for them, as the ſlaviſh ſubmiſſion to popiſh abſurdity, which is inculcated on the pain of damnation by the emiſſaries of the church of Rome, as is intimated in a fooliſh, but at the ſame time very pernicious book, ſet forth the laſt year by one Brook, on the behalf of the Iriſh papiſts, and cried up to the ſkies by ſome of our monthly critics, wherein one argument for the toleration of papiſts is, their readineſs, on account of their obedience to their eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors, to ſubmit to whatever the civil power may ſee fit to impoſe upon them.

I am, *Yours, &c.* *Juſtus Jonas Saxonicus.*

Dec. 11, 1764.

INTELLIGENCE EXTRAORDINARY.

SCOTLAND, *Nov.* 29.

WE hear that great preparations are making by the nurſery-men and gardeners of North-Britain, ſettled in and about London, for celebrating to-morrow the feſtival of our common patriot Saint *Andrew*, with proper eclat. The ſolemnity will open with a thankſgiving ſermon for the ſeaſonable removal of a late wicked Satyriſt*, to be preached by the *grand Eſtimator*, who is already ar-

* Churchill.

arrived there from the borders, and has proved his deſcent from Caledonian Progenitors in due form. After that will be a grand proceſſion to a convenient place, not far from South Audley-ſtreet, where the *Prophecy of Famine* will be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, officiating in the *Graſs Market*, who has been ſent for by expreſs to perform the ceremony. We are likewiſe aſſured that a complete collection of *contraſts*, *anti-times*, *epigrams*, *ſquibs*, *ſcraps*, and other *diſſections* of the late Mr Churchill, will ſpeedily be publiſhed in one ſuperb volume, decorated with Mr Hogarth's noted Bear-print, and the following motto, *Tutum eſt barbam vellere mortuo Leoni.* And for the better and more extenſive circulation of the ſaid ineſtimable pieces, the whole collection will be *accurately* and *impartially re-viewed* and *re-puffed*, by the monthly critics of both ſexes.

Edinburgh Courant.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 22, 1764.

NOthing can give the public a more favourable idea of the preſent adminiſtration, than the time that has been taken for the appointment of a new maſter of the rolls. It is one of the moſt important offices of the law, and ought to be filled by a perſon of the moſt approved integrity, and conſummate abilities; and to find ſuch a one properly qualified, muſt require much deliberation. The property of his majeſty's injured

jured ſubjects, and the lives of his innocent ones, muſt often be in great jeopardy in the hands of an ignorant or a corrupt officer preſiding in the ſeat of juſtice. In ſome other departments, the leading characters may do well enough with a leſs Share of Probity, and with little or no knowledge in the profeſſion where their ſtation is allotted. Our hiſtories, for inſtance, furniſh examples of battles being won, where the general of the victorious ſoldiery had neither the courage nor the ſkill to act his own part with any ſort of propriety: I own theſe events are a little precarious, and it would not be amiſs (to provide againſt the worſt) if a general ſhould have a little ſkill in the art of war, and have given ſome indiſputable tokens of his perſonal intrepidity. But as intervals of peace are much more frequent and durable, than ſeaſons of ſerious action, a good perſon well dreſſed, and a ferocious aſpect, may do very well at parades and reviews, and render true valour, and true generalſhip, but very *accidental* requiſites in a leader of armies. On another ſide, Biſhop Burnet ſpeaks of a Secretary of State, who ſtood amazed to hear mention made of the *circles* of Germany, and yet, for aught I can learn from that hiſtory, matters went very well in that Gentleman's office. And not to be tedious in inſtances, divinity is the laſt thing one thinks of, in eſtimating the qualifications of a clergyman for preſiding in the church. If theſe *Gentlemen* are but *clever* in ſome other articles, nobody expects they ſhould be ſent to *Canterbury* to be examined in Greek and Hebrew, before they put on their lawn: And a man ſtands a much better chance in my humble opi-

opinion for a rochet, who can write a political pamphlet, or a dedication to *the* man for the time being, than he that ſpends his precious time upon Grotius and Lightfoot, and the ſacred critics. The worſt thing I ever heard laid to the charge of Mr Churchill was, that falſe modeſty which compelled him to throw off his gown, as a garment altogether unſeemly for a poetical ſatyriſt. All the polite world agree, that his promotion to a Biſhoprick might have been juſtified by as many precedents at leaſt, as were produced of late for *general warrants*. All this is happily well underſtood, and therefore we never find our ſtate patrons venturing upon theſe ſeeming *anomalies* in the province of the *law*, though we may find them, or at leaſt remember when they have been found, in almoſt all other profeſſions and preferments which depend upon the ſmiles of a great man. I do not pretend to account for this, Mr Baldwin, but I hope the reaſons for it will ſubſiſt as long as the conſtitution of our country ſhall laſt, and that at leaſt I ſhall never live to ſee an attorney preferred to the principal ſeat in the King's Bench, or Common Pleas, who ſhall introduce himſelf to public notice, by a new edition, with critical notes, on Spencer's Fairie Queen, or by an elaborate commentary on Churchill's Dunciads.

I am, Sir,

Your conſtant Reader,

PHILONOMUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 29, 1764.

THE Patriot Biſhop Burnet (a Patriot Biſhop is not an *impoſſible* Character) hath ſomewhere called our *boroughs*, the *rotten* Part of the conſtitution: And I am afraid it cannot be denied, that they have contracted, ſince the Biſhop's days, no inconſiderable degree of putrefaction. I would hope, however, that there may be ſtill ſtrength and vigour enough left in the conſtitution itſelf, to undergo an amputation of her unſound and mortified parts, and to have her corrupted members reſtored to a ſtate of health and activity. The only difficulty will be, to find operators willing to undertake this ſalutary work; ſome, probably, who underſtand the nature of the malady well enough, may be concerned in intereſt that no remedy ſhould be applied; others, from different conſiderations, may diſſemble their opinion, and affect to believe that the parts in queſtion are as ſound and healthy as they *ought* to be. For my own part, it cannot enter into my head, that our prudent forefathers ſhould ever intend that the *freemen* and principal inhabitants of borough towns ſhould, by virtue of their tenure, degenerate into ſlaves; or that it ſhould ever be in the power of one generation of them, ſo to diſpoſe of the *franchiſes* of the community, that their poſterity ſhould be idle lookers-on, while certain perſons, called their repreſentatives, ſhould be impoſed upon them by the arbitrary *fiat* of one man, or choſen by the *occaſional* voices

voices of a number of ſtrangers, who would not loſe a ſingle farthing nor a ſingle acquaintance, if the borough and its inmates were to ſink into the ſea. It is well known, that it is not yet full forty years ſince the right of election was as open to be conteſted in borough towns as in other places, whenever the burghers thought themſelves injured by a wrong return; how this road to redreſs came to be blocked up, I can give no account. The fact, I am told is, that in a great number of inſtances, the right of election is not now veſted where it formerly uſed to be; and no great wonder, when boroughs fell under the management of mercenary lawmen and pettyſoggers, that their original conſtitution ſhould be miſrepreſented to anſwer lucrative ends; while the honeſt induſtrious tradeſman, intent upon his own buſineſs, had neither the means to detect the fallacy, nor to expoſe and puniſh the wrong doer, when cauſes of that kind were brought to a hearing. Now, Mr Baldwin, as by the repeal of a ſhort clauſe in a certain law, which, I am afraid, has not prevented what it was meant to prevent, many, at leaſt, of theſe boroughs would be in a condition to put in a freſh claim to their original rights and privileges, why ſhould we doubt but a ſufficient number of diſintereſted patriots might be found, who, upon a proper remonſtrance from the parties aggrieved, would lend their aſſiſtance thus far at leaſt? And who ſo proper to be applied to in this caſe, as our worthy repreſentatives of counties, whoſe honour it is to be choſen by the voices of *independent* freeholders? And why ſhould not theſe freeholders themſelves make it a point with their future repreſen-

ſentatives, at a proper opening, to have their fellow-ſubjects emancipated from this reproachful yoke of bondage, and put into a condition by a plain, expreſs, and general law, never more to be enthralled, either by the indigence or avarice of their fellow burghers, or by the chicanery of the moſt accompliſhed pettifogger that ever handled a pen? The ſecurity of public liberty, is equally the intereſt, and equally the concern of every individual Engliſhman; and I need not be particular in pointing out the acceſſion of ſtrength it would receive from the meaſure here recommended. I am,

Your conſtant Reader,
CARLIOLENSIS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 1, 1765.

AS you entertained your readers, in your paper of December 15, with the picture of a ſtateſman, it may not be amiſs to preſent them with a portrait of a patriot of the ſame country, as it will ſerve to ſhew what effect the politics of ſuch a ſtateſman at the helm, had upon the honour and probity of men in the lower claſſes of Life. The paſſage is copied from one of the beſt hiſtories of the laſt century, that of the edict of Nantes, vol. II. p. 237. "But there was another man of "great authority in Bearn, in whom the prote-"ſtants, who were the ſtronger party, had great "confidence: This was Leſcun, a Councellor in "the

" the ſovereign council of the country; an active,
" firm, and vigorous man, who had courage, un-
" derſtanding, and eloquence; and whom the
" Bearnois eſteemed as a perſon full of that gene-
" rous love of his country, and the public good,
" of which one no longer ſees examples but in
" ancient hiſtory. The miniſtry, on the contrary,
" would make him paſs for a factious and turbu-
" lent ſpirit; and took a pretence to ruin him,
" as a diſturber of the public repoſe, on account
" of the unwearied zeal he teſtified for the intereſts
" of his religion and his country. It is by this
" kind of ſeverities, that they who aſpire to deſ-
" potic power, endeavour to ſtifle in men's hearts
" the ſeeds of this virtue, which was formerly the
" nobleſt character of heroes. They have treated
" thoſe as ſtate criminals, who have thought that
" the chiefeſt obligation of an honeſt man, is to
" preſerve the privileges of his country; and they
" have clearly foreſeen, that men would be diſ-
" guſted with this grandeur of ſoul, ſo much re-
" vered heretofore, when they perceived that no-
" thing was to be hoped from it, but ſhame and
" miſery; and that all they were conſigned to the
" gallows or ſcaffold, to whom antiquity would
" have erected triumphal arches and ſtatues."
The ſequel of the hiſtory informs us, that after va-
rious ſtruggles to preſerve the liberty of his coun-
try, this honeſt whig Leſcun, was firſt proſcribed,
and afterwards brought to the ſcaffold; and the
brave Bearnois loſt both their religion and their
privileges. I am, Sir, *Yours, &c.*

AGRIPPA.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 8, 1765.

IN your Chronicle, of Saturday, Dec. 22, is an article of news, ſignifying, "that ſeveral copies "of Wilkes's letter to the gentlemen of Ayleſbury, "printed abroad, were ſeized at the cuſtom-houſe "at Dover, and carried to one of his Majeſty's "principal Secretaries of State." It is not mentioned for what reaſon theſe copies were ſeized, whether as contraband goods, or as goods endeavoured to be ſmuggled without paying duty, or laſtly as books obnoxious to government on account of their contents. It will hardly be ſaid, I ſuppoſe, that they become contraband by the ſingle circumſtance of being *printed abroad*, as it is well known that the importation of foreign books makes no inconſiderable branch of our commerce. Foreign books indeed, are, as I have been told, liable to a duty at the cuſtom-houſe where they are imported. If the importer of Wilkes's book attempted to evade his duty, the ſeizure was legal and proper, but this is no reaſon why they ſhould be ſent to his Majeſty's Secretaries of State, more than for ſending them teas and brandies, ſeized under the ſame circumſtances. It remains then, that this letter of Wilkes's contained ſeditious, perhaps treaſonable matter, and the cuſtom-houſe officers, being appriſed of this put it into proper hands, for the purpoſe of having it cenſured in a legal way. Nothing can do more honour to the cuſtom-houſe officers of Dover,

than their vigilance and activity on ſuch occaſions. The public owes them its thanks, as well as the particular perſons, who are more immediately affected. All I want, Mr Baldwin, is to have all officers, appointed and employed by the government, uniformly active and vigilant in all ſimilar caſes, where the intereſt or ſafety of the public is equally concerned. There is one ſort of books, which our laws allow not to be imported at any rate, namely, popiſh books, primers, manuals, roſaries, popiſh catechiſms, miſſals, breviaries, &c. &c. And yet, it is ſaid, that theſe are as frequently imported without ſeizure or moleſtation, as books of any other kind. I will not vouch for this; but, however, ſo much I know, that there are thouſands of them in the kingdom, of no *antient date*, bearing ample teſtimony againſt themſelves in their reſpective fronts; and yet I cannot ſay I have heard of late years of any ſeizures of this kind of contraband wares, either at a cuſtom-houſe, or elſewhere. May it be, that the importers of ſuch popiſh books have more dexterity in concealing their cargo, than the ſmugglers of Wilkes's letter? Or may it be, that the public are not as deeply intereſted in the ſeizure of breviaries and miſſals, and other ſuperſtitious traſh, which manifeſtly tend to corrupt the principles of his Majeſty's proteſtant ſubjects, and to pervert them from their religion and allegiance, as in the ſeizure of books of ſome other ſort? I would not be miſtaken; I know not the contents of Wilkes's letter, and therefore would not be underſtood to bring it into compariſon with theſe (perhaps, more innocent) popiſh books: Nor is it my intention to queſtion the power of cuſtom-houſe officers to *ſeize*, or of any other officers to *detain*, any books

books not prohibited by a particular law. All I will venture to presume is, that W—'s letter is not a *popish* book, or has any tendency to propagate popish or jacobite principles, as some writings, ascribed to the same author, seem to be calculated with a very different view. But still, W—'s letter may be *offensive* in another light, and deserve the flames equally with some others which have been consigned to them. All I desire is, that we may be uniform in our public justice; and if Mr Ketch is to sacrifice this letter in a bonfire, let a few faggots more be added to the fuel, and some imported missals and manuals (which may not be so hard to meet with as is imagined) bear it company.

I am, Sir, *Your's, &c.*

PHILODEMUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 8, 1765.

THERE is not so vain a creature upon earth as an author who fancies he hath met with a little success in the world, even though his performance may be nothing more considerable than an essay, which, by the indulgence of the publisher, has found its way into a news-paper. In saying this, I am describing my own case. Ever since I read in your Chronicle of Dec. 6, an advertisement, relating to *church leases**, I have been wonderfully

* The advertisement referred to, ran thus:—"All persons "in general who hold estates under any Dean and Chapter "within

elevated with a conceit that the intimations I have given in your paper of the danger to public liberty, incurred by trufting the church with too much wealth, have contributed to open the eyes of my countrymen, and, perhaps, given birth to the ſeaſonable examination propoſed in that advertiſement. And I am apt to give myſelf as much conſequence thereupon, as a certain brother-craft claimed ſome time ago, upon rouſing the ſpirit of our military men, as he ſuppoſed, by blowing the trumpet of an *eſtimate*. But be the motive what it will, I heartily congratulate my fellow ſubjects on this proſpect, and will venture to foretell them, upon

" within this kingdom, by leaſe, either for lives, or twenty-
" one years, or any other term, are earneſtly deſired, before
" the 10th of January next, to tranſmit an account thereof in
" writing to the members, or one of the members of parlia-
" ment for the reſpective counties or cities wherein the ſame
" lie, directed to the care of Mr White, a parliamentary clerk
" and ſolicitor, at the Houſe of Commons, deſcribing the fol-
" lowing particulars, viz. Whether the ſame conſiſt of lands,
" tythes, or houſes, and in what pariſh and county they be;
" under what Dean and Chapter held, and whether for lives
" or twenty-one years, or any and what other terms; at what
" yearly value, and at how many years and months purchaſe
" the ſame were reſpectively fined for, or rated, at the laſt
" renewal, either for one life or two lives or ſeven years, or
" any other and what term, or lapſe of a term, and how much
" ſuch fines have been raiſed, or encreaſed in proportion
" for the like renewals, within twenty-one years laſt paſt;
" what are the reſerved yearly rents, and whether ſubject to
" any deductions for taxes or other out-goings, and whether
" ſuch eſtates are in ſettlement or not, and what ſums of
" money are payable on ſuch renewals, for leaſes, ſeal-fees,
" alienations, officers, cakes and wine, or any other and what
" demands.

" As

upon the credit of ſome facts that have come to my knowledge, that a compliance with this well-timed invitation will open a ſcene, very likely to convince the moſt incredulous, how much better it would be for all parties, clergy as well as laity, to have theſe eccleſiaſtical revenues, as well as ſome others, put upon ſome other footing. This ſtep, at leaſt, will convince the leading clergy, that they are not ſo ſecure in their *ſtrong holds* as they are apt to imagine, and may help to diſpoſe them to underſtand, that the real intereſts of religion, and of the civil

 wel-

" As ſuch an enquiry may prove beneficial, not only to the " perſons immediately intereſted, but alſo to the public in " general, it is hoped that a ſpeedy as well as full and true " account will be given, ſo as the ſame may be ſupported and " juſtified upon a ſtrict and impartial examination."

St *James*'s Chronicle, *Dec.* 6, 1764.

This advertiſement it ſeems, ſtole into the St *James*'s Chronicle, without the ſpecial notice of the managers of it, as a thing of courſe. But the alarming tendency of the contents, brought upon the printer (as it came afterwards to be known) the high indignation of the great *Druid*, ſignified to him by the church's faithful pointer, *R-v-ngt-n*, not without menaces of a parliamentary cenſure for making ſo free with their reſpectable officer, Mr *White*. The printer, however, really unconſcious either of the author, or the meaning of his advertiſement, when it was inſerted, eſcaped, after a promiſe that it ſhould appear in his paper no more, though, as it was ſaid, money was ſent for a ſecond impreſſion. And all the ſatisfaction the benevolent author had, was the ſatisfaction of laughing in his corner at the panic of the great *Druid* and Co. and of admiring the patience and lenity of that company whoſe province it would otherwiſe have been to enquire into the nature of that craft by which the ſaid *Druid* and Co. had their wealth, and particularly what effect it had upon the intereſts of their conſtituents.

welfare of the people, are as much *their* concern, as the maintenance of an eſtabliſhment in all its external forms. Long and repeatedly have they been ſolicited to promote, by their influence, ſome edifying alterations in our preſent ſyſtem of doctrine, and forms of worſhip. But though the remonſtrances on this head were offered with all the becoming modeſty and deference due from inferiors to their principals, and, I will add, with all the good ſenſe and force of reaſon neceſſary to ſupport the beſt cauſe in the world, yet was a deaf ear turned to them all, upon the pretence (when they thought fit to aſſign any cauſe of this contemptuous neglect) that *no body knew where ſuch* diſquiſitions *might end*. Where under the appearance of a ſollicitude for *orthodoxy* in doctrine, and *decency* in worſhip, was plainly covered an apprehenſion, that a reformation, once ſet on foot, might poſſibly extend to the diſturbance of the church in more *ſubſtantial* inſtances. For nothing can more diſparage the learning and ſincerity of ſome of our leading divines, exhibited on *other* occaſions, than to ſuppoſe they are convinced that our liturgy and articles want no reviſion. The *advertiſers* therefore in your paper, Mr Baldwin, ſeem to have conſidered this matter better than the late *diſquiſitors*. Probably it may have occurred to them, that if *Harry* VIII. had not firſt of all reduced the revenues of the monks, which were the ſinews of ſuperſtition, the reformation would have made but little progreſs in the reigns of *Edward* and *Elizabeth*. The caſe ſeems to be plainly this: When churchmen of like paſſions with their ſecular brethren, obſerve and experience that the ſyſtem left them by their

pre-

predeceſſors, derives upon them wealth, honours, and power, and that their firm adherence to it, inſtead of diminiſhing their figure and influence, hath greatly increaſed both, nothing can betray a greater ignorance of human nature, than an expectation that they ſhould *acknowledge* any errors in the ſyſtem itſelf. Repreſent to them as ſtrongly as you will, that ſome parts of it may widely deviate from the grand exemplar, the *holy ſcriptures*, or have ſtill remaining in it ſome pernicious dregs of popiſh tyranny and ſuperſtition, it is all to no purpoſe; it is their intereſt to boaſt of the *beſt-conſtituted church on earth*, and though the perverſe multitude may not always be diſpoſed to believe them, yet being ſo neceſſary, as is pretended, to the *ſecular arm*, they are ſafe in the *reciprocation* of an *alliance* with that power, and may laugh with ſecurity at the feeble efforts of thoſe, who have nothing to oppoſe to them but *ſcripture* and *common ſenſe*. This is ſo evidently the caſe, that I have not a little wondered at a queſtion inſerted in a benevolent exhortation (often addreſſed in your Chronicle to learned and ingenious lovers of public liberty) "to anſwer certain *artful* and *ambiguous* "writings which the papiſts of late have ſcattered "with uncommon aſſiduity." The queſtion I mean is, *Why not the* clergy? It is certain the clergy *do not* anſwer them, and why they do not, is not at all unaccountable, if, as is natural to ſuppoſe, they are waiting for their cue from the *ſecular arm*. To this may be added an obſervation I have met with ſomewhere, viz. That whenever an able workman hath ſet himſelf to dig up the foundations of popery, he hath been apt, *eodem*

conatu, to lay bare thoſe of other prelatical hierarchies, which have no dependence upon the ſee of *Rome*. This work then muſt be done by *unclerical* hands, or, as far as I can ſee, left undone. And if the leſſees under Deans and Chapters and other eccleſiaſtical bodies, are deſtined to do this wholeſome and very ſeaſonable ſervice to the public, I cannot help ſaying to them.

Ite alacres, tantæque precor confidite cauſæ.

I am, SIR,

Your conſtant Reader,

PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 26, 1765.

IN a late letter, which was favoured with a place in your Chronicle, I mentioned the averſeneſs of the clergy in general, but particularly of the ſuperior claſſes, to all reviſals and alterations of our public ſervice, and other church forms, whether of faith or worſhip. I am now reminded, by the near approach of a ſolemn annual faſt-day, to give a ſtriking inſtance of their *adherence*, which has had a very pernicious influence upon the minds of the people, and may, without timely care, have the worſt effects. Whoever attentively peruſes the *form of prayer* for the 30th of *January*, will immediately obſerve, that it is framed on the old *Jure-divino* plan, and conſequently upon principles utterly inconſiſtent with thoſe upon which *only* the revolution is to be juſtified. Nor is even this the

worſt.

worſt. If the goſpel for the day, has any relation to King Charles I. no good chriſtian who underſtands the New Teſtament, and has a due veneration for his Redeemer, can read it, without being extremely ſhocked at the compariſon there ſuggeſted. Stateſmen may be allowed to care for none of theſe things: But that learned and pious churchmen ſhould be patient and ſilent under ſuch a blemiſh, which has been matter of ſcandal for a hundred years, would be perfectly aſtoniſhing, were it not to be accounted for upon a principle with which learning and piety have little connection. That it was decent for King Charles II. to commemorate the fate of his father in ſome religious ſervice, will not be denied, nor that it was fit for thoſe who reſtored him, *without conditions*, to join in it. But it could neither be decent, nor fit at any time, or upon any pretence, to have the ſufferings of King Charles I. compared to thoſe of our Saviour in a chriſtian aſſembly. The account we have from Biſhop Burnet of this ſervice is, "that it was drawn up by Sancroft in a very high "ſtrain; but another of a more moderate ſtrain "was preferred to it. But Sancroft coming to be "advanced to the ſee of Canterbury, got his office "to be publiſhed by the King's authority, in a "time, when ſo high a ſtyle as was in it, did not "ſound well in the nation." When therefore Sancroft himſelf was laid aſide, for adopting or adhering to principles ſuitable to his ſtyle, what had we to do any longer with Sancroft's office! And why is it ſtill ſuffered to ſtand among the forms of our public worſhip, to reproach and contradict every thing that was done at that period? Or, in-

deed, be the office what it will, what, in the name of common ſenſe, have we of this generation to do with the ſins of our forefathers (whatever they were) an hundred and twenty years ago? In anſwer to theſe queſtions, the clergy, I ſuppoſe, will tell us, "that King Charles I. was a martyr for "the church, that however he might fail as a "ſtate patriot, the church for which he died is "ſtill ſubſiſting, without undergoing any revolu-"tion, as the ſtate has done. And though the "principles in vogue, when the office was com-"poſed, have been a little out of faſhion ſince the "year 1688. (as indeed might be proved by ſome "martyrdom ſermons) yet who knows what may "happen at ſome future period, to *bring back* both "the day and the office to their ancient honour "and reverence." For my part, I do not think this clerical ſagacity at all likely to be diſappointed. It plainly appears to me, that the politics of Charles I. are not ſo alarming as they were about twenty years ago. It is not above three days ſince I read in a miniſterial pamphlet, "that if Charles I. had "reigned forty years ſooner, or forty years later, "he would have been eſteemed a good King." The writer muſt mean, with the ſame thirſt for arbitrary power, and the ſame diſpoſition to exerciſe it, which made a part of his character while he did reign, or the ſuppoſition is trifling, and means only that King Charles would have made a better King, if he had been a different ſort of man. But allowing his character to have remained the ſame, the preſumption is altogether againſt the pamphleteer. For what were the people of England doing forty years after King Charles the Firſt's Death? Even

ſtrug-

ſtruggling to get rid of a King, who was become inſupportable to them, by exhibiting in his politics the very ſame character and diſpoſitions that had ruined his father. On the other hand, no one can think that Charles would have had a better kingly eſtimation, had he come to the crown forty years ſooner than he did, who is able to compare the wiſdom and moderation of Elizabeth, arbitrary as ſhe might be in other reſpects, with the ungracious reſerve, fourneſs, and inflexibility of the martyr. The ſuppoſition, therefore, is only a ſlight of tory prejudice, tending to perſuade us, that political meaſures may be no worſe for being projected by a *Stuart*, if they only wear the ſame complexion with thoſe of the *good* King Charles. This notion, it ſeems, has already impoſed upon ſome *half-faced* whigs, who are for compounding the matter, by ſaying, "that though King Charles I. was but an "indifferent King, he was certainly a *good* man." A compliment, for which, if I underſtand the *Eikon Baſilike*, his Majeſty would not have thanked them. The language is indeed totally unintelligible to me, who can form no idea of a good man, apart from his diſcharging well the duties of that particular ſtation wherein providence has placed him. But it will be ſaid, perhaps, that King Charles diſcharged his duty to his people, to the beſt of his underſtanding. More ſhame, then, for thoſe about him, who did not inſtruct him better. At this diſtance, we can know nothing of this King, but from remaining hiſtories, and if I am to believe theſe, it will be very difficult to perſuade me, that the inſtances of his *indigerent Kingſhip* upon record, were all of them the product of his own

head, without his heart having any ſhare in them. But if this ſhould be but a doubtful point, it is certainly a ſufficient reaſon for diſmiſſing the form of prayer above-mentioned, where both the *innocence* and *divine appointment* of this unhappy Prince are aſſerted with ſo much confidence, in a ſolemn addreſs to the all-ſeeing God, who is equally diſpleaſed with thoſe who acquit the wicked, as with thoſe who ſlander the righteous. All I mean to ſay is, that ſuch judgments belong not to us; and while they continue to be put into our mouths, it will be an unanſwerable argument with me, that if certain ſhepherds may but wear the wool, and drink the milk of the flock at their eaſe, the ſheep may be left to ſeek wholeſome paſturage for themſelves, where they can find it, in lieu of the barren and meagre commons, provided by the paſtors.

I am, Sir, *Your's, &c.*

PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 16, 1765.

AMONG all the various complaints exhibited in your benevolent Chronicle, I will venture to ſay there is not a man, woman, or child, whoſe ſufferings, abuſes, and oppreſſions come up to mine. The ſingularity of my caſe is, that though hardly one in an hundred will really afford me harbour or entertainment, the remaining ninety-nine pretend, behind my back, to the moſt intimate acquaintance with me, and would, to a man, be

very

very miſerable, if they thought it were even ſuſpected that I was not their boſom-companion. By this means it happens, that my ſayings are quoted by men who never ſaw me (to their knowledge) in their days, and who notwithſtanding have the impudence to affirm things upon my authority, which I never ſo much as dreamt of. It was but the other day that a coxcomb, in a full coffee-room, was telling the company, upon my information forſooth, that *majorities* muſt always be in the right, becauſe *mere* underſtandings always judge better than *fewer*. Now I declare I never ſaw the fellow till that inſtant, and then never exchanged a word with him, much leſs ſhould I deliver that abſurd opinion, or that ſtill more abſurd reaſon for it, to him, or to any one elſe. For the reſt, I have hardly been in a majority this half-year, one excepted very lately in the city of London. You will eaſily conceive, Mr Printer, that a perſon in theſe whimſical circumſtances muſt be glad to turn himſelf into any ſhape for a little honeſt bread. The firſt profeſſion I attempted was the *clerical*, ſuppoſing I ſhould certainly ſucceed in that department, on the ſcore of ancient connexions. For you muſt know, Sir, it was Archbiſhop *Cranmer* who firſt brought my great anceſtor into this kingdom, in the days of King *Henry* VIII. In purſuance of this plan away I trudged to *Oxford* to qualify, but having the misfortune to hold the *wrong ſide* of almoſt every queſtion that came into diſpute, I was preſently expelled for *hereſy*. In the other univerſity I found a little more latitude and toleration, and conſequently more benevolent entertainment. But of late it has been found that

the

the *wrong ſide* will not do there, any more than at the other place; and being lately a little more mutinous in defence of it than ordinary, I was, with ſome of my partiſans, delivered over by authority to be *tackled*, an operation not unlike that of the thumb ſcrew, performed by an officer called a *ſcrewer*, or Serator, or ſome ſuch name. But as this worthy Gentleman had as little relish for *my* company as I had for *his*, he willingly connived at my eſcape, and I took refuge in a little *houſe* at the extremity of the town, to be in readineſs for the London waggon in caſe of accidents. As I had not miſpent my time in college, I now thought of church-preferment, and *in ordine ad*, was recommended by a particular friend to an eccleſiaſtic of great importance, who declared his readineſs to ſerve me, being, as he ſaid before my perſonal appearance, his old familiar friend and acquaintance. However, upon my being introduced, his reverence ſtarted back with ſurprize, profeſſed he never ſaw me before, that the perſon he meant made a very different figure, and that his rule was never to encourage *impoſtors*. The door of the church being thus ſhut upon me, I turned my views to the law, and took my ſtation in one of the Inns of Court. Here, indeed, I was ſuffered to ſleep quietly as long as I pleaſed; but the moment I awaked, the *Philiſtines* were upon me with the ſame malicious intent of making ſun with me, as their antitypes had done with blind *Samſon*. One twiſted my neck till my face looked to the ſame point of the compaſs with my rump; while others were writhing my hands and arms to accommodate them to the poſition of my countenance; one would teach me

to

to squint, another was busy oiling the organs of articulation; another would tie up a leg, and swear my *hop* was the gracefullest walk in the world. In this trim they were one day trussing me up in a coach, in order for an *exhibit* in Westminster Hall. But luckily for me, a certain judge coming by, knew me under all this distortion, enquired into my case, and delivered me from my torture. My adventures in the army, navy, college of physicians, Royal Society, and Royal Exchange, are too tedious for a single letter, and may possibly make the subject of a second. The last comfortable settlement I had, was with poor *Churchill* the poet. He was a wag, and would needs introduce me in laced clothes to one of the most tasty routs about town. It is impossible to express the infinite mirth my tawdry figure, contrasted by my conversation, occasioned in this transcendent assortment of quality and politeness. The Lord and Lady of the mansion, indeed, considered the affair in a serious light, and gave strict orders to the porter that no such extraordinary creatures should have admittance, on the peril of losing his place. Which, by the by, is no worse treatment than a namesake of mine seems to have had among the Roman quality of Juvenal's day's*. After all these buffetings, I have still many friends, and some who dare own me in fair open day light; but as I am cautious of exposing them, I confine myself to close quarters, especially since I hear a limb of the law threatens me with a horsewhip, only for rallying him with some success in a coffee house, after divers affronts and provocations, which had put me out of my usual temper. But let me not conclude without owning my particular obli-

* Rarus enim fermè sensus communis in illâ Fortunâ.

obligations to you, Mr. Baldwin; I mean for the kind entertainment I have ſo often met with at the Britannia Printing Office, even in the days of my adverſity. In return for which, if I live to ſee happier times (as I have had many *ups* and *downs* in the world, and ſtill expect more) and can be of any little ſervice to you or your Chronicle, you may always command

Your humble ſervant,

COMMON SENSE.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 16, 1765.

HAVING obſerved that the viſible and alarming increaſe of popery has been aſcribed, in ſome periodical papers, to the negligence of the parochial clergy, I hope I may be permitted, by your means, to offer ſuch an apology for thoſe Gentlemen, as the nature of the caſe, after all candid allowances are made, will admit of. The firſt queſtion I would aſk is, What care is taken to qualify our parochial clergy to encounter the papiſts? Is the diſcuſſion of the points in difference between proteſtants and papiſts among the academical exerciſes now, or for ſome years paſt, in uſe in our univerſities? Is the ſlighteſt knowledge of the merits of this particular controverſy, at all neceſſary for a man who is about to take orders? I cannot, after much enquiry, learn that either of theſe is the caſe. And, by what I can hear, the little theological pains that are taken with our young

young churchmen, are moſtly laid out upon the errors of *preſbyterians*, *methodiſts*, *ſocinians*, &c. who are all *proteſtants* at leaſt, and, upon their own principles, friends to toleration, free inquiry, and public liberty, and by conſequence, friends to our preſent civil eſtabliſhment, and to our gracious King at the head of it; whereas the principles of popery aim at the utter ruin both of the church and ſtate. It is true, gentlemen of the clergy may, if they pleaſe, qualify themſelves to confute popery, after they have left the univerſity, as it muſt be ſuppoſed that moſt of them bring from thence, or even from ſchool, a ſufficient ſtock of rudiments to enable them to purſue what ſtudy they think proper. But here comes in my ſecond queſtion. What encouragement have they to employ their time in *this* branch? To what account will it turn, that every twentieth man of the parochial clergy is expert in the popiſh controverſy, while the other nineteen never think about the matter, nor perhaps have ever heard from any one above their own rank, that any ſuch qualification is neceſſary? For my part, I never could obſerve, but that the pooreſt curate in the iſland has the ſame appetites as the moſt luxurious dignitary, and for aught that appears to me, has juſt the ſame right to gratify them; and if the poor curate finds that ſtrenuous oppoſition to popery is not the road to better bread and more comfortable emoluments, I ſhall not marvel if he leaves *that*, and takes another, which the hand of preferment points out to him. Nor do I think that this omiſſion will be a greater load upon *his* conſcience, than it is upon the conſcience of a ſuperior, who may be equally indifferent about the

matter

matter, and whoſe little finger might do more towards the diſcouraging popery in a day, than the united ſtrength of a dozen parochial curates would be able to do in ſeven years. On another hand, while this fatal remiſsneſs keeps down the proteſtant cauſe, What are the papiſts doing? Even driving on the ſame deſign they have had in hands for two hundred and forty years, and driving it on too with unabated ſpirit and fury; namely, the utter deſtruction of all hereticks, and conſigning the ſpoil to the exaltation of the church ſo called. In the proſecution of this work they have employed and ſtill continue to employ their whole attention; inculcating into their youth, in their ſeminaries, every circumſtance which may attach them to their ſuperſtition, and inſpiring them with the bittereſt and moſt irreconcileable hatred to every proteſtant that breathes. It is true, that in every community where they are the minority, they muſt carefully conceal this infernal ſpirit, and try to ſtrengthen their hands by guile and artifice, ſuit their lies and nonſenſe to the ignorance and weakneſs of the great and ſmall vulgar, and cover their march with every mark of civility, and inſiduous compliment to thoſe whoſe vigilance they deſire to elude. What ſucceſs they have had, let matters of fact, (which they are at no pains to diſſemble) ſpeak to the eyes and ears of the public. It is no ſecret what numbers are added to their emiſſaries by the breaking up of the French and Portugueſe jeſuits, whom, in our preſent ſtate of ſlumber, they already find a thouſand ways to make uſeful to their grand deſign. Indeed, ſhould they ſucceed in it, and become the majority, there would be no

far-

farther occaſion to ſtudy the particulars of our controverſies with them. The whole would be reduced to a ſhort argument of three words, *turn* or *burn*. This logic they derive from their Engliſh Saint Mary, and it is become as ſacred with them as the *Trent*-Catechiſm. Foreign papiſts have been known to relent and to relax of their ſeverity towards proteſtants: But no toleration, no civility was ever found to abate the malice or ſweeten the ſpirit of an Engliſh catholic. In the mean time, whoever is to blame for throwing their preſent advantages into their hands, every mortal of common ſenſe muſt ſee that the torrent is not to be ſtemmed by ſuch a body of men as the parochial clergy, gifted and diſpoſed as too many of them are. If, indeed, a kind providence ſhould favour us with a new race of *Tillotſons*, *Burnets*, *Barrows*, *Tenniſons*, *Stillingfleets*, *Lloyds*, *Fleetwoods*, &c. things would ſoon put on another face. Under the auſpices of ſuch leaders, the parochial clergy would learn the uſe and application of their arms, and begin to outvie each other in oppoſing and confounding this peſt of all true religion, and rational liberty, till they had left us nothing to fear from this all-exterminating ſect, whoſe inſolence, increaſing with their numbers, fills ſo many honeſt and ſerious minds with moſt melancholy apprehenſions. I am, SIR,

Yours, &c.

MISOMUMPSIMUS.*

* This ſignature having appeared in ſeveral Newſpaper-Eſſays of late, it may be proper to mention that thoſe Eſſays are the work of a different hand.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 27, 1765.

YOUR correſpondent *Sacerdos Ruſticus*, is extremely happy in his ſituation. "In the "neighbourhood where he lives, there is not ſuch "a phænomenon as a papiſt to be ſeen in the cir- "cuit of ſeveral miles: And in the towns he occa- "ſionally viſits, he cannot, upon enquiry, hear "of any converſions lately made or attempted." Lucky man! and lucky neighbourhood! But what is his inference from hence? A curious one indeed. Namely, that there are *no* neighbourhoods in the country, where there are papiſts to be ſeen, *no* country towns where converſions are lately made or attempted. For he immediately ſends us to the "metropolis as the *ſuppoſed* field where theſe per- "nicious tares are ſowing, and thrive ſo faſt." But, "General aſſertions, he ſays, of ſuch doings, "even in the metropolis, will not ſuffice to prove "the point to him and his neighbours, who live "at a diſtance, the charge muſt be authenticated "by particular proofs and cirumſtantial evidence." Now this, Sir, I am afraid is but a copy of his countenance. It is plain he ſees the news-papers, and will he pretend that he has not ſeen in thoſe papers *circumſtantial* accounts of popiſh chapels lately multiplied, re-edified when ruinous, and afterwards filled as full, or fuller, than any church or meeting-houſe of proteſtants in the metropolis. But poſſibly this, though it manifeſtly implies a large

large increaſe of papiſts, is not ſufficiently circumſtantial for our country parſon. I will therefore ſo far befriend him, as to put him in a way to *exculpate* himſelf and the whole brotherhood, great and ſmall, (if it is to be done at all) and that in a method perfectly canonical. And that is, by an application to my Lords the Biſhops, requeſting them to give orders, either by themſelves or their Archdeacons, to the parochial clergy all over England, to make returns of all the papiſts in their reſpective parithes at the enſuing viſitations, ſpecifying how many of theſe have been perverted from the proteſtant religion to popery within the laſt ſeven or ten years. The publication of theſe liſts would end the controverſy at once, and carry the cauſe, either for the plaintiffs or defendants, without more ado. In the mean time, and till ſuch liſts are publiſhed, every man is at liberty to make his own inferences from the facts that fall within his obſervation. However, upon ſecond thoughts, I am inclined to *exculpate* this dealer in *paradoxes* and *phænomena* without farther proceſs. I do not doubt but he has ſeen a pamphlet, written by a ſtrenuous Advocate for Colony-biſhops, wherein it is aſſerted, that *popiſh Biſhops reſide here* [in England] *and go about to exerciſe* every part *of their function, without offence, and without obſervation.* Now if this country parſon ſhould be one of thoſe, who out of their great veneration for the epiſcopal character, are not apt to be *offended* with this open exerciſe of the function of a popiſh Biſhop, is it not poſſible that he may be a little ſlack in his *obſervations* upon them? and conſequently paſs by many of theſe popiſh phænomena without *ſeeing* them?

He calls upon me "to shew him the adversary, "and the acts of hostility he has commenced," and says, "I shall not long want the entertain- "ment of seeing him engaged and overthrown." Well then, I take him at his Word, and shew him, *The Trial of Roman Catholics* of *Ireland*, by one *Brooks*. I shew him a jesuitical pamphlet dispersed all over the kingdom, importing the *unreasonableness* of the *penal laws* against papists in our own country, upon account (among other reasons) of their agreement with the church of England in many material points. And lastly, I shew him Father Philips's life of Cardinal Pole, the greatest insult upon historical truth and the common sense of a protestant nation, that has appeared since the revolution. As I therefore have accepted his challenge, I shall impatiently expect the *entertainment* he has promised me, and shall not take it well to be put off with his joke about *knight-errantry*, when I have shewn him the adversary in the field in all his armour The brave champions of the protestant cause of former times, this *sacerdotal rustic* may see in my letter, I honour as much as any man, and not the less for their being champions of the church of England. But he must excuse me if I cannot allow him, and his brother curates, to dress themselves in the borrowed feathers of these ancient worthies. Suffice it that I have shewn him adversaries differently equipped from those with whom our fore-fathers had to do, and when he has done execution upon them equal to that our fore-fathers did upon the adversaries of their days, despised and branded be the man, who will deny him equal honours. His insinuation "that the viru-

"lence

" lence with which ſome late obſervations on this " ſubject are thrown out, gives room to ſuſpect " the pleaſure of traducing the clergy, was at " leaſt as great, as the fears of increaſing popery," I leave to the judgment of the impartial public: And to bring all parties into good humour at parting, ſhall conclude with a ſhort ſtory which I tranſcribe out of a book accidentally lying open before me. Sir Robert Howard being taxed with *whipping the clergy of the eſtabliſhment upon the backs of popiſh prieſts*, (with whom it ſeems he made very free in his writings) replied with great compoſure —*What had they to do there?*

I am, SIR,

Your conſtant reader,

MISOMUMPSIMUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March* 14, 1765.

CARDINAL Richelieu having expoſtulated ſharply with the Conde d'Olivarez, on the inſolence of his Catholic Majeſty's ſubjects in the Netherlands and elſewhere, who had ſatyrized the French government in a variety of libels, lampoons, pictures, &c. was anſwered by the Spaniard, " That " if the affairs of Spain were but in as proſperous " a ſituation as thoſe of France, the Spaniſh mini- " ſtry would give themſelves little pain, though " all the Gallic wits and painters in the kingdom " were let looſe to ſcandalize and expoſe them."

Oli-

Olivarez was certainly in the right. He was well aware that *power* and *proſperity* have no occaſion for the ſupport of *truth* and *juſtice*, and that the ſecurity of a ſtateſman conſiſted in the number and ſtrength of his party, and the means he might have of attaching it to him by the ties of intereſt. On the other hand, Cardinal Richelieu was exceſſively galled, and made ſore by ſatyrical writings levelled at his perſon and miniſtry, and extremely vindictive when the authors of them were diſcovered: But this is by no means to be reckoned among the proofs of his ſound policy, or the tokens of his prudence. It only ſerved to multiply his enemies, and make him ſtill more odious to the public. Whoever reads the hiſtory of France, during Richelieu's miniſtry, will eaſily perceive, that there was food enough for ſatyr and invective, not only within the confines of the kingdom, but in every corner of Europe, where French counſels had any influence; and it is certain, that the ſatyriſts of thoſe days were not ſlack in pointing out the perſonal vices of Richelieu, as well as the various evils of his miniſtry. But what then? What effect had all theſe ſquibs and crackers upon this Cardinal's meaſures? In what one inſtance was he made aſhamed of his iniquities, or in what one article were his politics defeated, or even obſtructed by them? No, he knew, and he ought to have conſidered, that libels would raiſe no ſoldiers, pay no penſions, confer no places, or titles of honour. A libel againſt a powerful miniſter, or his under-ſtrappers, is (as has been lately well obſerved by certain miniſterial critics in a noted *preface*) *Telum imbelle ſine ictu*. It is the hardeſt thing in the world to make a Miniſter

niſter of State ridiculous. Nothing is ridiculous but what is, at the ſame time, an object of contempt, and no man can ſafely *deſpiſe* a powerful Miniſter of State. The only thing that Miniſters of State have to fear from libels ſo called, is the being made *odious* to the people: And that ſeldom happens, but where facts are laid to their charge, in *ſerious* writings, which are capable of the cleareſt proof. But where even this is the caſe, were I a Miniſter of State, I ſhould certainly adopt Hezekiah's politics, *Anſwer him not a word.* Few miniſters have been written out of power, but in two caſes: Either 1ſt, by their own weak and frivolous anſwers to charges of importance; or 2d, by their ſeverities to the authors of ſuch charges, or their aiders and abettors. With reſpect to the former caſe, I have heard it obſerved, as an example worthy to be imitated by the civil powers, that when the *free and candid diſquiſitions* appeared, and it was found by two or three ſpecimens, that no great execution could be done by *anſwering*, ſome *late* great churchmen adviſed a profound ſilence; which counſel being adopted in ſucceeding times, the happy event has fully juſtified it; and we hear now no more of faults in our public liturgy, than they do at Paris of blemiſhes in their miſſals. On the other hand, the vengeance taken of Prynne, and others, was viſibly inſtrumental to the fall of Laud. The *Hiſtriomaſtix* was a provoking book to the court, but it contained a number of important truths, which Laud, and his agents, could not confute otherwiſe than by the pillory. But where was the wiſdom of that meaſure? For one man that knew the merits of the cauſe by merely reading the

book, a thouſand were made acquainted with it by the hiſtory and ſufferings of the author. By that means every cobler was put in poſſeſſion of facts which otherwiſe he would never have known, and, being thus enlightened, every cobler could ſee that the pillory was but a *wooden* anſwer to a plain narrative, ſuported by the moſt authentic evidence. Theſe are not the only precedents in hiſtory of the good effects of *patience* in a miniſtry. If Miniſters of State are falſely accuſed, a very little time will do them juſtice, and ſet them right with the people. If important charges, ſupported by proof, are fixed upon them in a pamphlet, what is the conſequence? Why, it has good-luck if it is read by one in every thouſand, or if it is believed or regarded by one in every fifty that read it. Thence it becomes the talk of the coffee-houſes, where a week or two makes it ſtale; it is laid aſide for a newer ſubject, the author keeps his ears on his head, and the miniſters their places, and there's an end of the buſineſs. Beſides, in ſuch a conſtitution as ours, it is not always that libellers, ſo deemed by a miniſtry, can be *legally* come at. And as ſoon as you ſtretch a point of law againſt a popular writer, you never fail to hear of *Magna Charta*, the *Petition of Right* in *Charles* I. reign, and *the Bill of Rights* in that of *William* III. and an hundred other things which have but an ugly aſpect towards thoſe whoſe encroachments become viſible, and which would probably be laid dormant, if not conſigned to oblivion, by huſbanding your power ſo that it might be felt in its effects, rather than expoſed to be examined by conſtitutional principles. In one word, Mr. Baldwin, my opinion is, that brimſtone itſelf will

not

not cure the itch of ſcribbling in Engliſhmen; and the beſt way is to let them ſcratch till they are ſore, and then probably they may give over for their own ſakes. The only danger is, that they may poſſibly, by continual exerciſe, *looſen* their *ſcrubbing-poſts*, which is the leſs likely to happen if they are but fixed and rooted in the ſame workmanlike manner that ſome craftſmen from the northern part of our united iſland, where ſuch conveniences are of ancient uſe, are ſaid to practiſe.

I am, SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

UTOPIENSIS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March* 16, 1765.

LOITERING one morning in a noted bookſeller's ſhop, a well-dreſſed Gentleman came in, between whom and the maſter of the hôtel, the following dialogue immediately commenced.

Gentleman. Good morrow, Mr. ——.

Bookſeller. Sir, your moſt obedient. You are a great ſtranger in —— ——; I hope his Lordſhip is well.

Gent. Yes, and wants to know whether you have procured for him the firſt edition of Pope's *Eſſay on Man.*

Bookſ. Upon my conſcience, Sir, I have ſent a dozen times at leaſt through the whole trade, and cannot hear of one of theſe early editions. For my

part, I wonder what the d—l is become of them all. But, hark you, Sir,—what a pox ails my Lord, that he cannot read the *Eſſay* in one of theſe ſmaller editions, with the commentary and notes, *(Taking down the firſt volume of* Pope's *Works in twelves, and flattering the leaves.)* I don't pretend to be a judge myſelf; but a Gentleman who *peruſes* for me, aſſures me, there are a great number of d——d clever things in the commentary, and will needs have it, that it muſt have coſt almoſt as much time and labour in making as the *Eſſay* itſelf.

Gent. Not unlikely. But Mr. ——, if you will only turn to the frontiſpiece, you'll preſently ſee the reaſon why my Lord chuſes to read the *Eſſay* without the commentary.

Bookſ. *(After poring about half a minute on the print)* The frontiſpiece! why what the plague is the matter with the frontiſpiece? I remember it took a deviliſh deal of ſettling. But upon ſeeing the firſt eſſay of the plate, a certain perſon who ſhall be nameleſs, but who had no inconſiderable intereſt in the edition, declared it was the moſt elegant and expreſſive emblem he had ever ſeen.

Gent. As to elegance, every one to his taſte. But certainly more expreſſive it could not be. For you may obſerve, Mr. ——, the poet looks *one* way, and the commentator *another*.

Bookſ. Ha! Ha! Ha! by the Lord Harry, and ſo they do—Ha! Ha! Ha! But, adad, there's no joke in it neither. It is a curſed unlucky remark, let me tell you, and I'll be hang'd if any body would have hit on't but his Lordſhip. But you muſt know, I never meddle with theſe matters;

ters; they are all left to my brother *******, who values himself highly on his talent of designing. And now I think on't, he was put into a hellish passion, by a Gentleman's observing, that in this very print the commentator had a whole wheelbarrow-full of flowers under his nose, while the festoon ran up devilish thin to the back of the poet's head.

Gent. Oh, Sir, there is exquisite expression in that too. The commentator is living, the poet is —dead.

Bookf. Ah, Sir, you're confounded smoaky!—But—Mr. ——, dear Sir, do let me send my Lord this edition. You know he may read the text without reading a tittle of the commentary.

Gent. But why should my Lord pay for so much of what is of no manner of use to him? Notifiers, who are at the same time editors, may sometimes be under a temptation to accommodate the text *to*, as well as *with* their criticisms. So, Sir, if you cannot oblige my Lord with Mr. *Pope*'s own edition of the Essay—I must enquire elsewhere. Your servant.

Bookf. I'm excessively sorry,—but—but—Sir, your most obedient.

I wrote this remarkable conference down, Mr. Baldwin, as soon as I got to my lodgings, I think nearly word for word. If you think it will entertain your readers, it is at their and your service.

I am, Sir, *Your humble servant*,

A LOWNGER.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March* 23, 1765.

AS the following extract may help to open the eyes even of the popiſh poſſeſſors of church lands, after all the aſſurances given them by the Jeſuit *Philips*, in his Life of Cardinal *Pole*, I hope you will give it a place in your Chronicle; it is taken from a letter written to Dr. *Burnet*, giving an account of Cardinal *Pole*'s ſecret powers, &c. and printed in the firſt volume of Biſhop Burnet's Tracts in quarto, 1685.

" This whole tranſaction was a public cheat put " on the nation, or at leaſt on the poſſeſſors of the " abbey-lands; nor did it" [*Pole*'s abſolution under the Pope's Breves] " grant them either a good " title in law, (I mean the canon-law) or give " any ſecurity to their conſciences in enjoying that " which, according to the doctrine of the church " of Rome, is plain ſacrilege. And therefore I " cannot imagine how thoſe of that church can " quiet their conſciences in the poſſeſſion of thoſe " lands. It is plain, by the progreſs of this mat- " ter, that the court of Rome never intended to " confirm the abbey-lands; for all that was done " by *Pole*, was only an artifice to ſtill men's fears, " and to lay the clamour which the apprehenſion " of the return of popery was raiſing, that ſo it " might once enter with the leſs oppoſition; and " then it would be eaſy to carry all leſſer matters, " when the great point was once gained, as the " ſaddle

" ſaddle goes into the bargain for the horſe. And " indeed, though a poor heretic may hope for " mercy, notwithſtanding his abbey-lands, becauſe " it may be ſuppoſed to be a ſin of ignorance in " him, ſo that he poſſeſſes them with a good con- " ſcience, and is that which the law calls *bonæ* " *fidei poſſeſſor*; yet I ſee no remedy for ſuch as " go over to the church of Rome: For if there is " a ſin in the world that is condemned by that " church, it is ſacrilege; ſo that they muſt be " *malæ fidei poſſeſſores*, that continue in it after the " enlightening which that church offers them. A " man may as well be a papiſt, and not believe " tranſubſtantiation, nor worſhip the hoſt, as be " one, and ſtill enjoy his church lands. Nor can " any confeſſor, that underſtands the principles of " his own religion, give abſolution to ſuch as are " involved in that guilt, without reſtitution. So " vain a thing it is to talk of ſecuring men in the " poſſeſſion of thoſe lands, if popery ſhould ever " prevail. For though the court of Rome would, " to facilitate our reconciliation, offer ſome deceit- " ful confirmation, as was done by Cardinal *Pole*, " yet no man, after he went over to that church, " could ſuffer himſelf to enjoy them."

I omit ſome other things in this letter to the ſame purpoſe, leſt I ſhould make too long an extract for your paper. Enough is here exhibited to ſet father *Philips* to work with his caſuiſtry, to find an anodyne for the conſciences of theſe *malæ fidei poſſeſſores* in Great Britain; and enough to give the public a juſt idea of the honeſty of the Pope, the piety and ſincerity of *Pole*, as well as of the modeſty of his biographer, in order to ſhew

the folly of the popiſh writers of theſe days, in bringing their claims upon the public ſtage before they have acquired influence and power ſufficient to enable them to ſuppreſs all our hiſtories, as well as all our bibles. I am, Sir,

Your conſtant reader,

No PHILIPPIZER.

P. S. Juſt as I had finiſhed my letter, a friend ſtepped in, and having peruſed it, deſired me to add his compliments to the *Critical Reviewers*, with a requeſt that they would favour him, by the channel of your Chronicle, with an account how many of the Roman Catholics of their acquaintance, moderate in their principles, and dutiful in their behaviour to the preſent eſtabliſhment, are poſſeſſors of abbey-lands; and whether ſuch of them as are ſo poſſeſſed, are ſeverally accommodated with ſpecial bulls from Rome, of the ſame tenor and force with that which Secretary *Petre* obtained for the ſecure enjoyment of the church-lands in his poſſeſſion.

To the PRINTER.

March, 30, 1765.

PERMIT me, Sir, once more, by your means, to pay my reſpects to *Sacerdos Ruſticus*, particularly for his information that "the very wor-"thy Regius Profeſſor of Divinity in one of our "univerſities, is, at this very time, carrying on a "courſe of theological inſtitutions, in which the "candidates for orders have an opportunity of

"being

" being inſtructed in the whole circle of that ſci-
" ence." I thank him moſt kindly for this intelli-
gence, and from this fact beg leave to draw two very obvious inferences, 1. That the venerable curators of youth in *this* univerſity are at length become ſenſible that ſomething had been wanting among them heretofore, to complete the education of candidates for orders. 2. That the preſent parochial clergy (whoſe apology I undertook) having moſt of them left the univerſities long ago, cannot be at all wiſer for *any courſe* carrying on, *at this very time*, in either of the univerſities. With reſpect to the real benefit of ſuch a *courſe*, one might have better judged of it, had *Sacerdos* told us what the *opportunities* of being inſtructed by it are, and of what ſtanding the candidate to whom they are afforded. On another hand, What does the Gentleman mean by *the whole circle of that ſcience?* Papiſtical theology makes *a part* of the *whole* circle. And I cannot perſuade myſelf, that a very worthy Profeſſor, in a proteſtant univerſity, will take into his courſe the inſtitutions of Aquinas, Scotus, Occam, Bellarmine, or Eſcobar. I have likewiſe a diſlike to a courſe of theological inſtitutions, as thoſe words look like a deſcription of an artificial ſyſtem, which the ſcriptures are often made to *follow*, than to *lead*. I had much rather have been told, that the worthy Profeſſor was employing his labours in plain expoſitions of the ſcriptures, without any regard to ſyſtematical points, eſtabliſhed by human authority: Such labours, I am perſuaded, are the readieſt and the moſt hopeful to qualify clerical candidates for the province of confuting popery. Perhaps, indeed, the worthy Profeſſor may be

taking this very method, and the honeſt Ruſtic may be only deſcribing it in his own *Mumpſimus*-terms. However, I congratulate this univerſity, on its growing wiſer than it was in the days of yore, when Dean Prideaux was ſcandalized, that "many perſons as ſoon as they had taken the degree of Batchelors of Arts, offered themſelves for orders, and were too often admitted to be teachers in the church, when they were only fit to be catechumens therein. Theſe conſiderations made the Doctor [Prideaux] often lament the loſs of Dr. Buſby's benefaction, who offered to found two catechiſtical lectures, one in each univerſity, with an endowment of one hundred pounds per annum each, for inſtructing the undergraduates in *the rudiments of the chriſtian religion*; provided all the ſaid undergraduates ſhould be obliged to attend thoſe lectures, and none of them be admitted to the degree of Bathelors of Arts, till after having been examined by the Catechiſt, as to their knowledge in the *doctrines* and *precepts of the chriſtian religion*, and by him approved of. But this condition being rejected by *both* univerſities, the benefaction was rejected therewith; and the church hath ever ſince ſuffered for the want of it." Life of Dr. H. Prideaux, 1748, p. 91, 92.—It is well that *one* of the univerſities hath ſeen its miſtake. And what hath *Sacerdos* to ſay for the other? Nothing. He is ſilent.—I could tell him, if I would, where common fame ſays Philip's life of Cardinal Pole was printed: But in whatever inſtance either of the univerſities may want an advocate on a future occaſion, they will, I think, hardly employ Sacerdos Ruſticus to defend

defend them, who, in the ſimplicity of his heart, hath confirmed *two* of the *virulent reflections* on the clergy publiſhed as he will needs have it, by his very good friend and brother.

MISOMUMPSIMUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 13, 1765.

THE *clergyman in the church of England*, who figured in your Chronicle of March 21, having expreſſed "the great ſatisfaction with which "he hath often read the celebrated Dean Swift's "excellent preface to the Biſhop of Sarum's In-"troduction," it may perhaps gratify the curioſity of ſome of your readers, to give a ſhort account of the Biſhop's *introduction*, as well as of the *preface* above-mentioned, to which it gave occaſion. After which, perhaps, we may form ſome tolerable judgment of this clergyman's *true* principles. Every one knows in what apprehenſions the wiſe and honeſt part of the nation were, that a popiſh ſucceſſor might be obtruded upon them by the miniſtry which was in play during the four laſt years of Queen Anne. In the laſt of theſe four years, Biſhop Burnet publiſhed the introduction to the third volume of his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, alone, by way of a warning-piece to his fellow-ſubjects at that perilous criſis, to have an eye upon what might be hatching to the prejudice of their religion and liberties. They who will take the pains, or rather the pleaſure to read the whole

introduction, will eaſily conceive how galling ſuch a reſcript muſt be to men who lay under ſuch ſuſpicions. Swift was at that time their thorough-paced tool, and having an infinite fund of ſatyrical humour, a rancorous hatred of revolution principles, and not the leaſt feeling of *truth* or *falſehood*, when the cauſe of *toryiſm* and of the *ſacred order* was at ſtake, it had been the greateſt of all wonders if ſo ſerious, ſo ſeaſonable, and ſo important a remonſtrance as the *introduction*, had eſcaped his Billingſgate. What ſucceſs his preface had with any but his own party, I am not able to ſay; but in the next year the preface was confuted with a vengeance. In that year, viz. 1715, the Biſhop publiſhed the third volume of his hiſtory, with this introduction prefixed, and a dedication to his Majeſty George I. of bleſſed memory, who had juſt then providentially ſucceeded to the crown of Great Britain. And now came the time when Biſhop Burnet's excellent noſe for popery, even at five hundred miles diſtance, appeared beyond the power of contradiction. For this gracious King was hardly warm in his throne, when a moſt audacious rebellion was formed in favour of a popiſh pretender to his crown, and (what fully juſtified Biſhop Burnet's warnings and prognoſtics) was openly eſpouſed by three of the late Queen's miniſters, Ormond, Mar, and Bolingbroke, who all acted under the pretender's commiſſions, in the moſt important characters: Not to mention Oxford's chaplain, who, according to Boſingbroke, managed, among others, the correſpondence between the pretender's emiſſaries abroad, and the rebels at home. All theſe had been Swift's maſters, and were his boſom friends; of that very Dean

Swift,

Swift, Mr Baldwin, whose *preface* this worthy *clergyman of the church of England* reads with such exquisite delight!—that very *preface* which was written to screen these heroes, and their fellows, from all suspicion of popish connexions! Is it possible to imagine that these men, who smelled so rank of popery in the first year of King George, should have no unsavoury stench of it about them in the last year of Queen Anne? It is quite unnecessary to enter farther into the contents of this *clergyman's* letter. There is not a sensible protestant in Britain who will not nose the man and his principles, at the distance of twice five hundred miles. For one thing, indeed, I think we are obliged to him; and that is, for pointing out this *Introduction* to us, which has lain too long in obscurity. He talks of re-printing Swift's preface. How that may suit the *occasions* of his present *patrons* or *clients*, he best knows. But were it not for one circumstance, I would earnestly recommend the re-printing Bishop Burnet's Introduction. My scruple is this: The doctrine of *libels* is at present in such a see-saw situation, and there are in this *Introduction* some features of the present time in so high draught, that it might be very difficult even for the most dextrous publisher to keep clear of certain hooks called *innuendos*, if the parties made sore should throw them out to catch him. I am almost ashamed, Mr. Baldwin, to give you this trouble so soon after my strictures on the *new code*, but I hope I shall be excused when it is considered that as the present clerical system begins to devellop, it belongs to the province in which I have tasked myself, to point out the smallest *aspirings* that are brought out to view.

view. We have got one here indeed, who appears to be in a violent hurry to exercise the whip; a *true blue* of the antient *Laudean* stamp, who seems to care little what becomes of the liberties and properties of the laiety, so that the church is but at ease in her privileges and possessions; for there he makes his stop, though in my opinion a little too unwarily for the credit of his cause, while he insinuates that the church is safer from the attempts of the papists, than from the toleration of protestant dissenters; which I think no mortal can account for, in the present state of our *civil* constitution, but by supposing that there is a congenial sameness in the original institutions of the two hierarchies In pursuance of this thought, the poor gentleman wants more *power* and *authority* to trim *fanatics*, which may be difficult to come at, *as yet*, on this side the water. What if we were to send him into our colonies, by way of propagating the system of the *code-monger?* He and his brother *Sacerdos Rusticus*, would make two excellent Colony Bishops, if they were but previously tutored a little better in the *mysteries* of the grand *alliance*, which, I am sorry to observe, neither of them seems to have studied with proper attention. And therefore, before they are invested with colony lawn, I would humbly propose they should go through a course of *cryptics*, under the inspection of the adroit *Thinker on civil liberty, licentiousness, and faction*, by way of learning to cover their match.

I am, Sir, your's, &c.

PLEBEIUS.

LON.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *Dec.* 4, 1764.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *York, Nov.* 22, 1764.

HAVING obſerved in your paper, an advertiſement often repeated, inviting, "the lovers of religious liberty, and the civil conſtitution of this country, to anſwer certain artful and ambiguous writings, publiſhed here and in Ireland, in favour of popery," I take the freedom to *mark out* ONE ſuch writing, publiſhed in your Chronicle of the 17th of this month. I mean a letter ſaid to be read in the Romiſh chapels of Kilkenny in Ireland, addreſſed to the *Reverend Roman Catholic Paſtors* there (ſee p. 478) by ſome popiſh eccleſiaſtic, pretending, as it ſhould ſeem, to epiſcopal authority in the dioceſe of Oſſory. In this letter, ſuch papiſts as are among the lawleſs crew, called *White Boys*, are exhorted to leave them, and to return to their duty, under the pain of being *puniſhed to the utmoſt of the power which the ſaid eccleſiaſtic hath from God and the church.* This might be tolerable, did not this overweening prieſt add, *I am not only encouraged, but likewiſe* REQUESTED *to do ſo (i. e.* to puniſh them by popiſh church-cenſures) *by* PERSONAGES IN POWER. —And is it then come to this? Are the civil powers in Ireland become ſo weak, as to be under a neceſſity to *requeſt* aſſiſtance (and *ſuch* aſſiſtance) from

from a popiſh prieſt, to ſuppreſs a rebellious rabble, already obnoxious, by repeated outrages, to the ſevereſt animadverſion of the law? Is the ſtrength of government at ſo low an ebb in that kingdom, as to be driven to ſuch unbecoming expedients of preſerving public peace and order?—To fly to the *ſuccedaneum* of Romiſh thunder, played by one whoſe character has no exiſtence in Ireland but by connivance, and whoſe very pretence to eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction *there* is actually illegal?—No, Sir. Be it known to you and your readers, that the noble and honourable perſonages who preſide in the adminiſtration of the Iriſh government, are men of another ſtamp: Men of abilities to plan, of firmneſs to ſupport, and ſpirit to execute, every ſalutary meaſure tending to the peace, proſperity, and ſafety of Ireland. Nor can they be more baſely traduced and injured than by the remoteſt ſuſpicion of their holding any ſuch correſpondence.

I know, Sir, that the publiſhers of our public prints are, and muſt be often impoſed upon by thoſe who ſend them intelligence, nor is it to be expected that they ſhould previouſly inquire into the truth or falſehood of every article they infert. But when they are apprized of any deception (eſpecially of ſuch importance as this) the public has all the reaſon in the world to expect the ſpeedieſt acknowledgment of their miſtake. I therefore hope you will publiſh this letter of mine the firſt opportunity after it comes to your hands, together with an account whence you had your intelligence, the rather, as other news-papers may take it from yours and propagate the ſlander ſtill farther, deviſed (per-

(perhaps on this ſide the water) for the moſt invidious purpoſes. For ſo far as I can judge from what I have ſeen, not one of all the writings ſuppoſed to be aimed at the preſent adminiſtration, is calculated to leave worſe impreſſions than this very letter in queſtion. I am, Sir, &c.

G. B. *an Iriſh Proteſtant.*

**** The letter referred to above, was copied from a morning paper of the ſame day.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *March* 23, 1765.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

IT were to be wiſhed that the nominal proteſtant who anſwers *Britannicus* in your Chronicle of Feb. 14, (ſee p. 159) had been a little more intelligible in his technical terms. He ſays, that "the "apprehenſions *Britannicus* expreſſes at the en- "creaſe of popery in this kingdom, are ſufficient "to alarm the attention of every man who wiſhes "well to the eſtabliſhed religion of this country, "and to the civil conſtitution which muſt ſtand or "fall with it." What does he mean by *the eſtabliſhed religion of this country?* Does he mean *chriſtianity* in general? Certainly not: That would imply that popery is at enmity with the chriſtian religion. A doctrine, to which (if I miſtake not his complexion) he would be loath to ſubſcribe. Does he mean then, the *proteſtant religion* in general?

ral? By no means; for that would be to allow, that *proteſtant diſſenters* of all denominations are of the eſtabliſhed religion, and *our* proteſtant would tell us, they are only *tolerated*. It remains then, that by *eſtabliſhed religion* the writer means religion eſtabliſhed under the government of an epiſcopal hierarchy, with the rites, diſcipline, and privileges peculiar to the church of *England*, ſo called. But then how does it appear that our civil conſtitution muſt ſtand or fall with *this* eſtabliſhment? If this proteſtant adopts the logic of old King James, *No Biſhop, no King*, we muſt refer him, as he does *Britannicus*, to the hiſtory of his own country, which will inform him, that ever ſince the year 1706, *the Scots* have enjoyed the full benefit of our civil conſtitution, without having any Biſhops, or any of the Engliſh rites and ceremonies eſtabliſhed among them. And perhaps it might be difficult to ſhew how our civil conſtitution would ſuffer, if the legiſlature ſhould think fit to *reduce* the hierarchy to a co-ordinate parity, in the ſouthern part of the iſland. I willingly paſs over *Britannicus*'s remarks on the conduct of our civil governors with reſpect to popery, and right readily take the *proteſtant*'s word for the value they ſet upon religion; I will even do ſtill more, I will take it for granted the civil powers would exert themſelves in oppoſition to popery, if the clergy would ſolicit their ſupport and countenance. What I want to know is, Why their aid is *not* ſolicited by the clergy, if, as this man aſſures us, the latter are ſo ready to ſtand forth in the ſpirit of their religion, &c. In juſtification of the clergy, our proteſtant refers us to their acts

and

and deeds. When? Why, before and at the revolution. But what merit can the *preſent* clergy derive from ſervices ſo remote from theſe times? Has this proteſtant forgot, or has he never heard of the conduct of his clients in ſome intermediate periods of time? Did he never hear of the Doctors *Sacheverel* and *Swift?* Or of the *Memorial* of the church of *England?* Was he never informed, how loud the cry, how numerous the pack, how earneſt the purſuit was of thoſe who would have hunted down Biſhop *Hoadley* for aſſerting the civil and religious liberties of his country, upon the genuine principles of the revolution? And did not theſe very *hunters* inſiſt that they *ſtood forth in the ſpirit of their religion, and of the beſt conſtituted church in the world?* If the *reproach* of theſe men belongs not to the preſent clergy, neither does the *praiſe* of thoſe who figured at the revolution? Well, but the clergy retrieved all their honour on occaſion of the rebellion in 1745; and have they not had their reward? However, I am a little doubtful of the fact, for I have now before me a printed thankſgiving ſermon, preached by an eminent prelate, upon occaſion of the peace in 1749, wherein it is ſaid, that the people were *wonderfully jealous of the power of their own church.* Could the people be ſo ungrateful in the ſhort interval of three years, if the cauſes of their *jealouſy* did not overbalance the ſervices of the church in the day of common peril?—It is, however, immediately added, *but perfectly eaſy about the daily growth of popery.* I was too young then to know how the fact was. But perhaps our people might act upon a very rational principle, viz. that popery could never

never do much harm in *England*, unleſs it ſhould be kept in countenance by the powers claimed by our own hierarchy: On this ſuppoſition, they certainly attacked popery at the right end. Be this as it might, the preſent queſtions are, What have the clergy done *ſince?* What are they doing *now* againſt popery? And what is popery doing *now*, not ſo much againſt the clergy, as againſt the peace, liberty, and civil welfare of the whole realm?—Of this laſt our proteſtant affects to be ignorant, that he may not be under a neceſſity of anſwering the two former queries. However, I deſire the proteſtant to ſpeak no farther than he knows, and therefore ſhall only aſk, Have no complaints been made to ſome churchmen in authority of the increaſe of popery? Has no evidence been offered them of the fact? Has this evidence been openly laid before the public, and the falſehood of it ſhewn and reproved? Or if undeniably true, have the clergy acted as becomes a chriſtian and a proteſtant miniſtry in ſuch caſes? I only deſire to be conſidered as a queriſt, wanting and hoping for ſuch ſatisfaction as may be moſt honourable to the church of which I am an unworthy member. This reminds me, Mr. Printer, of a ſhort innuendo immediately preceding the proteſtant's letter in in your Chronicle, to which, though often repeated in yours, and other news-papers, I never could meet with any anſwer. If it be really true that our epiſcopal leaders are for epiſcopizing the diſſenters in our colonies, it is undoubtedly a proof that (contrary to what the above-mentioned prelate aſſured us in 1749, viz. that *the church hath and deſires leſs power, than any other in any age*) the

the church of *England* is become desirous not only to *increase* but to *extend* her ecclesiastical power to the remotest climes. And whenever this was the case in this country, all our histories agree, that popery was strengthened and increased, just in proportion as the church succeeded in her claims and attempts of this kind. I am, Sir, &c.

ANUPOCRITUS.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *April* 15, 1765.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

I Lately met with a pamphlet, intitled *Thoughts on Civil Liberty, Licentiousness, and Faction*, which appears, by many *indelible characters*, to be the work of a churchman, but more particularly by a proposal *to establish a prescribed code of* [Religious] *education, to which all the members of the community should legally submit.* I have been always apprehensive, that the increasing riches of the established clergy would, at some future time, tempt the ambitious and aspiring part of them to apply their influence towards the reduction of their fellow-subjects to a state of popish bondage: Of this I have already given warning in your Chronicle more than once; but I must own I was not aware, till now, that the mask would be dropped so soon. Hitherto protestants (when they were honestly and fairly dealt with) have been taught to believe that the *scriptures* are a sufficient code of religious education,

cation, as being *able to make every one wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus:* And would that order of men who are solemnly appointed, and so bountifully paid to educate our youth, and to instruct the ignorant of all ranks out of this code, act with the diligence, fidelity, long-suffering, humility, and self-denial, prescribed in the code itself, the community, I am persuaded, would have nothing to fear from the licentiousness or faction of its members. What occasion have we then for any other code of religious education? Why, the grievance lies here: The present code permits the members of the community to judge for themselves in matters of religion, and, what is more intolerable, exhorts them to stand fast in their christian liberty, and to be no more entangled in the yoke of bondage; and seems to express an abhorrence of all *legal* methods of enforcing religion; and I don't know but some insinuations in it might turn greatly to the disadvantage of some leading characters in a certain department, if perverse people should take it into their heads to compare the rule in the code with the exemplification of it in the said department. But it will be said, that none of this can affect our present clergy, who are established and firmly rooted in a *legal* soil, and live in the midst of a generation not very alert to resent, or even remark encroachments or deviations from public duty of any sort. All this is very true. But the code of the scriptures is still in being to be consulted; and another generation may arise, of a more inquisitive, active, and reforming turn, and break in unseasonably upon the hopeful scheme of perpetuating the yoke which their forefathers bore

so

ſo patiently. And as ſuch *reformers* would come under more than one of our *Thinker*'s Marks of *faction*, it behoveth to provide a timely corrective for the light and liberty afforded by our ancient code, and to bend the underſtandings and wills of our people *in time* to a *legal ſubmiſſion* to whatever their reverend educators might think fit to preſcribe. For though I have as much deference for the judgment and preciſion of this *diſintereſted* author, as the tendency of his labours will admit of, I cannot altogether commend his prudence in *timing* his propoſal. I have obſerved, Mr. Baldwin, that ſeveral of your correſpondents have remarked and lamented that our eſtabliſhed clergy do not interpoſe their endeavours with ſufficient vigour, to obſtruct the alarming progreſs of popery; and I am not without apprehenſions, that this project of a *new religious code of education*, may help ſome odd people to account for this *nonchalance* of their paſtors. The great riſque which civil liberty runs, under the influence of popery, ariſes from its pretenſions to an abſolute dominion over the underſtandings and conſciences of the people; but ſuch dominion, though built upon the ſame general principles in *every* caſe, may be exerciſed under very different ſyſtems; and methinks I ſee pretty clearly, that popery cannot be attacked *a fundamentis*, without laying bare the ſame iniquity in the principles upon which this *new religious code* is founded: Perhaps our author may think his project ſufficiently qualified by the word *legal*; but is not the inquiſition *legal* in *Spain?* was not the writ *de Hæretico Comburendo legal* in England? and are not all three, notwithſtanding

ſtanding their *legality*, *eccleſiaſtical* projects? This author appears to me to have learned his rudiments in the ſchool of the *alliance between church and ſtate*, and might by way of trial exhibit a ſpecimen, in this project, of the delicious fruit that tree will bear, perhaps not without a view to a compact of his own, viz. ſo much dignity and revenue for ſo much *jus divinum*. After all I cannot help ſuſpecting that this propoſal of a new code is a little premature. The people of England will bear much, but they will not bear every thing at once; they muſt be trained to the yoke by gentle degrees. Even toryiſm, rampant as it is, is obliged to make its ſtops now and then behind a ſtalking horſe. And yet, methinks, it were a thouſand pities that this *moral* and *political* code ſhould be ſtifled in the birth. *A-propos*, Mr. Baldwin! your Chronicle informs us, that we are going to ſend Biſhops to our colonies; ſuppoſe this code-maker were ſet to work immediately, ſo as to have his ſyſtem of inſtitution ready to embark with the firſt detachment of our R. R. miſſionaries. The wit of man cannot deviſe a more hopeful expedient to refine and regulate the religious notions of our fanatic coloniſts. Not to mention its probable effects upon the Cherokees, &c. When it had done its buſineſs among theſe, it might then be re-tranſmitted to the mother country with the double recommendation of its own intrinſic value, and authentic teſtimonials of its ſalutary operation; and by going through ſo many throats abroad, may be rendered more glib for deglutition among the various ſects of our domeſtic community. I am, Sir,

Your conſtant reader,

PLEBEIUS.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 30, 1765.

THERE is no principle, in the whole detail of political ſcience, more inconteſtable in theory, more equitable in practice, or more indiſpenſably neceſſary to the peace and welfare of every civil community, than that they, who refuſe to give the common ſecurity of good ſubjects to the government under which they live, on the pretence that the authority of that government is an *uſurped* or an *unlawful* authority, ſhould be abſolutely deprived of all protection from that government, with reſpect to whatever concerns either the ſafety of their perſons, or their private property. Such objectors are enemies to the ſtate which they thus characterize, and the moment they become the ſtronger party, they will, and are obliged by their principles, to diſſeize the ruling powers, ſubvert the form of the government, and transfer the authority to him, or them, whom they conceive to have a better title to it. This is the caſe with reſpect to the papiſts of Great Britain and Ireland. Not one of them pledges his fealty and allegiance to his Majeſty King George III. or will recognize his title to the imperial crown of theſe realms *upon any occaſion*. Their objections, indeed, are ſaid to be various; moſt of them, however, adhere equally to the Pope's ſupremacy, and the Pretender's hereditary right; and *all* of them to *one* or *other* of

them. And these being matters of fact, what, in the name of common sense, can it signify to his most gracious Majesty, or his protestant subjects, whether it is a Pope, or a man that calls himself Stuart, who forms pretensions to the government of these kingdoms? I mention this to obviate a foolish and false suggestion, which the papists have for ever in their mouths, viz. That they are laid under their present civil incapacities on account of their religion. Every one knows that the Popes, in virtue of their supremacy, claim, and have on many occasions exercised, a power of excommunicating Kings, of absolving their subjects from their allegiance, and of laying whole kingdoms under an interdict. This surely is exercising *civil power* with a vengeance; and undoubtedly whoever *acknowledges* the supremacy of the Pope, is an enemy upon principle, to the Prince and the State who *disown* it, and has no wrong done him in being treated as such by that Prince or State. These maxims were so plain to our wise protestant forefathers, that they thought it sufficient evidence of treason in any man, if he should be *convicted* of *popery*; in all other cases overt acts of another sort were necessary to convict the criminal. Innumerable histories conspire to justify the wisdom of our ancestors in enacting these just and salutary laws; and no man, I apprehend, would venture too much in affirming, that the very safety and well-being of our protestant government depend upon these laws being carried into execution. What reason can be given why a fellow should be hanged for enlisting an English subject or foreign service, that will not hold good for hanging

hanging a popiſh prieſt, or a popiſh layman, who ſhall pervert an Engliſh ſubject to popery, ſince every ſuch perverted perſon becomes the Pope's, or the Pretender's ſoldier the moment he goes to maſs? And there cannot be the leaſt doubt, but that when the papiſts have *compleated their levies*, ſo as to have an army in readineſs, able to face that of the preſent government, they will begin the old dance of *fifteen* and *forty-five*, and with more ſpirit and alacrity in proportion as they may have a better proſpect of ſucceſs. They who recollect the behaviour of the papiſts in the winter 1745, muſt have obſerved that even they among them, who had more prudence and caution than actually to appear in arms for the cauſe, had always the earlieſt intelligence of the motions and operations of the rebel-army, and whenever things went well with them, teſtified a particular joy and ſatisfaction in their countenances, and, the leſs wary ſort, in their converſation. And I am ſo certain that the ſame ſpirit ſtill animates every individual papiſt now in the kingdom, that I would venture all I am worth, that not a man of them can be produced, upon whom the preſent government could depend, in caſe of the like exigency; which heaven avert! This being a plain ſtate of the caſe, give me leave to make a few reflections upon it. Your Chronicle, Mr Baldwin, and every other impartial news-paper, hath exhibited loud and repeated complaints of the manifeſt increaſe of popery, and of the numbers of converts that are made in different parts of the kingdom. Theſe complaints have been juſtified by facts, to which I could furniſh very conſiderable and authentic addi-

tions from my own neighbourhood. In the mean time we hear nothing of what either our civil or eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors are doing even to check an evil of this deſtructive tendency. We do not hear of a ſingle queſtion aſked by any public authority, whether theſe repreſentations are true? We who live at a diſtance from the metropolis, and conſequently from the mart of news and politics, and know no more of what is doing in your upper world than what the public prints exhibit, are at a loſs to conjecture, by what maxims our domeſtic policy may be now regulated. We ſee what a thriving plant popery is in the country where we live: We find it equally flouriſhes in other parts of the kingdom. Hence we are alarmed with very diſagreeable apprehenſions: For ſome of us have read the hiſtories of former times, and are apt to talk of them one among another: And though we are willing to hope and ſuppoſe (from their profound ſilence) that our watchful governors *know* that we have no juſt grounds for our fears (I mean in a *political* light) yet we can give ourſelves no reaſon why *we* ſhould not know it too. We are ſtill more aſtoniſhed that we hear nothing upon the ſubject from our ſpiritual fathers. Politicians may have their reaſons for acting in a manner incomprehenſible to vulgar underſtandings; but teachers of religion ſhould be plain and open, and extend their cares to the edification of every ſingle ſheep of the flock. Can it be agreeable to our venerable fathers that popery makes ſuch depredations in the proteſtant fold? Are their ſentiments different, with reſpect to the pernicious errors of popery, from thoſe of their moſt worthy predeceſſors? If

ſo,

ſo, why are we not informed of it? It is ſaid that they are now conſulting meaſures for the more effectual propagating of chriſtianity among the Indians: May heaven vouchſafe its choiceſt bleſſings upon every righteous and diſintereſted ſcheme of this tendency! But may I, with all humility, and all due deference to this truly reverend bench, preſume to mention a probable obſtruction to their chriſtian endeavours, ariſing from the ſpread of popery, compared with a circumſtance in the preſent propagating plan? It ſeems that ſending *Biſhops* among theſe poor ſavage *idolaters* is judged to be the moſt hopeful method of making ſpeedy and extenſive converſions. It is ſaid, however, that this propoſal of ſending Biſhops to our colonies is not reliſhed by ſome, who nevertheleſs wiſh exceeding well to the converſion of the Indians. Suppoſe then ſome of thoſe who diſlike this epiſcopizing plan ſhould argue in this manner. "We "ſee, though epiſcopacy has been ſo long eſta-"bliſhed in England, and has been exerciſed with "every advantage which could give weight and "dignity to the order, yet that idolatry ſtill makes "an alarming progreſs at home, and even in-"creaſes every day conſiderably. What hope "then can we have, that epiſcopacy will be more "efficacious in ſubduing Indian idolatry abroad, "than it is in preventing or aboliſhing popiſh ido-"latry at home?" I am, Sir, &c.

QUÆSTOR.

York, April
22, 1765.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 14, 1765.

WHEN, about the beginning of the preſent century, a certain learned body were deliberating what cenſure to paſs upon *Whiſton* for his hereſy, an old member of the aſſembly, whoſe name was *Trigg*, propoſed that he, the ſaid *Whiſton*, ſhould be incarcerated *ſine die*, and occaſionally exhibited once a month, or once a quarter, in the Univerſity Church, upon a ſtool, with a paper pinned on his breaſt denoting his offence. A Gentleman of a more liberal turn, having objected to this ſentence, as being too like the proceedings of the inquiſition, Mr. *Trigg* is ſaid to have replied, *To be ſure the inquiſition has many damn'd things in it, but for all that it is of excellent uſe to keep matters tight.* Hence certain methods of *keeping matters tight* came to be called *Triggiſm* for a long time, and particularly ſuch methods as, under a leſs odious name, would *keep matters tight* as effectually as the inquiſition itſelf. After the acceſſion of the Brunſwic family to the throne of Great Britain, *Triggiſm* went much out of faſhion. Our ſovereigns of that illuſtrious and auſpicious houſe deteſted it, nor would ſuffer their miniſters, had they been ſo diſpoſed, to avail themſelves of it in the leaſt degree, to the great ſcandal of the orthodox Dr. Smollett, who, in the extract you gave us, Mr. Bald-

Baldwin, a while ago from his *continuation*, ſeems to reckon it among the crimes of the whig miniſters, "that they affected, on all occaſions, a ſpirit of "toleration in matters of religion." What an happy turn are theſe matters now likely to take among us! "The family of *Stuart* no longer ſtig-"matized! all opportunities taken from every "man of giving himſelf, or his party credit for "the revolution!" and, what is not the leaſt advantage of the preſent ſyſtem, the revival of *Triggiſm!* Glorious *Triggiſm!* how decent and forbearing in thy appearance! how powerful in thy operations! To burn or incarcerate a man for his religious opinions would have an ugly look; and, conſidering the temper of the people, would be impolitic, eſpecially as matters may be kept equally *tight* by ſtarving him, without giving the leaſt alarm to any party. If a man finds fault with the ſyſtem in vogue, and is audacious enough to mark himſelf for a diſſenter, by a free and open reprehenſion of what he thinks amiſs in it, your familiars have nothing to do but to delate him; and for the reſt, leave him at liberty. You, moſt noble and venerable *Triggiſts*, have commonly pretty large powers of excluſion and are ſeldom without the means of ſtopping all the avenues to advancement with reſpect to impracticable men. Let one of theſe be as able and even as eminent in his profeſſion as you will, you run no riſque in keeping him down. No man will ſuſpect that you can have any envy or ill-will againſt one who is ſo much below you. The world will ſay, "the poor man has had ill luck; he wants friends; "or they will not exert themſelves; 'tis a thouſand

"pities!

" pities! but thus it muſt be whilſt we live in ſuch " a world as this." In theſe lamentations, you, Gentlemen *Triggiſts*, may join, and that with as much *real* compaſſion and humanity at leaſt as the brethren of the holy office, when they beſeech the ſecular arm by the bowels of ——— to ſpare the poor heretic turned over to it by their ſentence, with the ſole view of having him conſumed to aſhes. Fear not that the poor excluded devil will want his torment: men who are bred to any liberal profeſſion are generally at a conſiderable expence in qualifying; an expence too often to be defrayed by the miſerable pittance left to a younger brother, out of an encumbered eſtate. If ſuch a one ſhould find himſelf hurt or galled by the *tightneſs* of his bonds, and breaking looſe from them, betake himſelf to the regions of truth and liberty, keep him from riſing even to ſo moderate an intereſt for the capital ſunk in his education, as two per cent. Depend upon it, merit will do nothing for him without your countenance, and it will often happen that he muſt ſit down to no better dinner than the priſons of the inquiſition would afford him; which, to do them juſtice, are ſaid not to be always ſcanty in this article: And who can call this perſecution? I own this is chiefly eccleſiaſtical *Triggiſm*. Political *Triggiſm* has a more ſpacious range. The *ſtarving* political *Triggiſm* extends to the ouſting a man of his poſſeſſions *in eſſe*, as well as excluding him from thoſe *in poſſe*. Beſides this, things *are kept tight* in the ſtate by fines, impriſonments, pillories, and other engines, which, for aught that is known to the million, may be conſiſtent with law, and even with public liberty.

The

The term *ſtar-chamber*, is a vile phraſe, of an exceeding ill ſound. But *Triggiſm* furniſhes another term which will do the very ſame execution, and that with reſpect to delinquencies, which a jury might perhaps find to be extremely problematical. In ſhort, Mr Baldwin, the beauties, benefits, and excellencies of a well-managed *Triggiſm*, where the machine is too crazy and tender, to be roughly handled, are not to be told within the reaſonable compaſs to which your correſpondents ſhould confine themſelves. A friend of mine tells me he is writing a *juſt* diſſertation upon the ſubject, which he promiſes to communicate when finiſhed. He tells me he has been at great pains to learn the names and employments of a variety of officers belonging to this *harmleſs* tribunal, ſuch as *proppers*, *whiteners*, *ſtiffers*, *maſkers*, *thumpers*, *balance-maſters*, *complete hiſtorians*, &c. &c. As ſome extracts from this work may, probably, entertain your readers, you may depend, when an opportunity offers of making them, upon hearing farther from, Sir,

Your humble ſervant,

IANUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 16, 1765.

A Few days ago I met with a little book, entitled, *Forms of ſelf-examination, adapted to the circumſtances, relations, and duties, of rulers and governors in church and ſtate;* by a poor Curate of Hampſhire; printed in the year 1713; in which there

is ſomething extremely remarkable. The author tells his readers in the preface, that "the heads "of ſelf-examination in *The Whole Duty of Man*, "and other books of devotion, concern only ſuch "offences and tranſgreſſions as are common to "chriſtians of all ranks and degrees, and do not "come ſufficiently home to the defaults of great "men in high offices, who, having the whole pub-"lic for their neighbour, muſt incur greater guilt "by any breaches of the ſecond table toward that "public, than a man in a private ſtation, whoſe "obligations lie within a leſs compaſs." According to this doctrine, the public may be robbed, murdered, adulterated, ſlandered, and variouſly injured by thoſe who ſhould be its protectors; which was by no means a complaiſant inſinuation with reſpect to the men in power of thoſe times. It is poſſible, however, that the Great Perſonages of thoſe days, though ever ſo obnoxious, might eſcape from the ſmart of ſuch a laſh, eſpecially if the language of 1713 was (as is probable enough) the ſame as the language of 1765. *The public* ſeems to be an equivocal term. It formerly was, and with ſome few people ſtill may be, a term of reſpect. But if we may take the ſenſe of ſome of the advocates for preſent political meaſures, *The public* means only a *factious*, *ſeditious*, *ſchiſmatical* mob, whom a Miniſter of State, or even an Arhbiſhop, might diſown for their neighbour, without any imputation upon their chriſtian charity. But to go on with our poor Curate; who had the honeſty and the courage to put to their purgation the conſciences of a Lord Treaſurer, a Secretary of State, a Privy Counſellor, a General of an Army, a Lord Chancellor, a Judge, an Archbiſhop,

biſhop, a Biſhop, and ſeveral others, by propoſing ſelf examining interrogatories, adapted to the reſpective obligations of each. The two leading queſtions which ſtand at the head of every chapter or title, are theſe: 1. "Do I believe that there is "a God who made the world, and all things "therein, and who continually governs it by his "providence?" 2. "Am I perſuaded that there "will be an awful judgment in the world to come, "where every one will be called to a ſtrict account "for the good or evil of his doings?" And here we are ſent, by a note of reference, to the margin, where we are informed, "That he who cannot "anſwer theſe two queſtions in the affirmative, "need not go on to the others, but may lay by "the book till he can." This is worſe and worſe, and I have little doubt but many in thoſe days would cry ſhame on the ſaucy Curate, and aſk, what he had to do with the creed of a politician, a great churchman, or a great lawyer? And whether he expected they ſhould come to him to be catechiſed? And had he lived in theſe times, ſomebody perhaps might have queſtioned the propriety of his mentioning divine providence in the ſelf-examination of a ſtateſman. "The ſyſtem of na-"ture (ſays an eminent divine of theſe days) has "the omnipotent hand of providence to curb the "blind violence of ſtubborn matter, which, but "for that gracious protection, would, in the fury "of its courſe, reduce itſelf to its former chaos: "The political ſyſtem has nothing but the provi-"dence of government to ſuſtain it againſt its own "madneſs from falling into anarchy." Whence, "as I take it, it follows, that divine providence

not affording any means of ſupport to the political ſyſtem, the ſtateſman can be under no neceſſity of accounting to it, for the application of ſuch means, as, by the ſtate of the caſe, he is obliged to provide for himſelf. So much are we improved, in a courſe of fifty years, in our notions of providence. But I forget, and muſt not take up too much of your paper, and therefore deſire room only for one more of theſe queſtions, which is the 7th under the title *Prime Miniſter*, viz. "Do I faithfully acquaint "my Royal Miſtreſs with the ſenſe of her people "upon the ſtate of public affairs, and lay before "her, without diſguiſe, the grievances they have "juſt cauſe to complain of?" The Earl of Oxford had then the reputation of being Prime Miniſter to the Queen, and no man in the kingdom had better intelligence of the ſentiments of all parties than his Lordſhip, for he is ſaid to have managed them all by turns. The ſenſe, however, of all parties (except the party attached to the miniſtry) upon public affairs was indeed the ſame, namely, that the peace was a very wretched one, not only tarniſhing the glory of her Majeſty's victorious arms, and caſting a ſlur upon the good faith of the nation, with reſpect to the engagements of the grand alliance, but introducing likewiſe many diſadvantages into our trade, by an unfavourable treaty of commerce. The hearts of all the well-wiſhers to Britiſh liberty were likewiſe full of diſmal apprehenſions, that the miniſtry meant no good to the conſtitution, in caſe of a demiſe of the crown, from the favour ſhewn to papiſts, and the penſions and employments confered on many known jacobites, and friends to

France

France and the Pretender. Nobody knew all this better than the Earl of Oxford: It appeared, indeed, from his remonſtrances againſt his fellow-miniſters, when they fell out, that he had been all along aware of it. But there is not the leaſt appearance, in any thing that dropped from her Majeſty, either in public or private, that ſhe knew a ſyllable of the matter; and nothing was ever more pitiable than the deluſion of this poor Curate, if he imagined that even the terrors of a future judgment would have drawn this information from the Lord Treaſurer, whilſt he knew that his very exiſtence in that office depended upon keeping that ſort of intelligence from the royal ear. It coſts a ſtateſman nothing to repreſent the murmurers and complainers, as a pitiful crew, deſpicable for their numbers as well as influence. And generally ſpeaking, they may find volunteers enough to blacken the moſt meritorious men with the ſlander of faction and licentiouſneſs; as their devoted writers being too much ſuſpected to be employed in the cauſe of truth and liberty, may be kept in expectancy as long as the miniſter pleaſes; or, in caſe of a temporary revolt, may be whiſtled back again upon ſhewing them once more the bait which drew them in at the firſt. There are inſtances upon record of ſuch men being in the ſervice of the miniſtry of 1713; and it is to be feared ſome of this kind of corruption may have ſtuck to human nature, even in more modern times. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

BOREALIS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 25, 1765.

STRANGE as it may appear, it is a certain fact, that Lewis the Fourteenth, whom the French hiſtorians of the laſt age called, *the greateſt and wiſeſt of all Kings*, had been full forty years on the throne before he knew that the Jeſuits had been baniſhed from France, by an arret of parliament, in the reign of his grandfather Henry the Fourth. Such, it ſeems, was the addreſs and influence of theſe venerable fathers, during that long interval, that means were found to conceal, from the grand monarque, ſo intereſting an event; which, had he known it in the early part of his life, might have given a turn to his politics, very different from that which was purſued by the Jeſuits, and his jeſuited miniſters. The occaſion upon which this anecdote came to his knowledge was this: A few years before the revocation of the edict of Nantes, many violences were committed upon the proteſtants, by way of making room for that laſt fatal ſtroke. The proteſtants of Troyes in Champagne, having ſuffered by ſome of theſe injuſtices, ſent deputies to court to remonſtrate their grievances, who were fortunate enough to obtain an audience of the king. The orator who harangued his Majeſty on that occaſion, made incidental mention of the baniſhment of the Jeſuits, to the great aſtoniſhment of Lewis, who had never

ſaſ-

ſuſpected any ſuch matter, and from whom the truth could no longer be concealed. My author obſerves on this occaſion that "it is probable "Kings learn hiſtory in a manner different from all "other perſons," meaning that they have hiſtories put into their hands (perhaps written on purpoſe for them) where ſome important facts are totally ſuppreſſed, and others recorded that never had any exiſtence. With reſpect to popiſh Kings, I am apt to believe, this is more than probable; and it is certain, that if they, who have the care of educating ſuch Princes, are diſpoſed to treat them in this baſe and unworthy manner, they may do it without running the hazard of being detected, till it may be too late to prevent the bad effects of the prepoſſeſſion. Let a preceptor be ever ſo able and of ever ſo liberal a mind himſelf, he muſt purſue the directions given him by his ſuperiors, on the peril of loſing whatever he might hope to reap by the pains taken with his royal pupil; and if catholic prieſts intereſt themſelves in the affair, there is no hope that a Prince, educated under their influence, ſhould ever be the better for any farther light that may be communicated to him when he is of age and ability to judge for himſelf. We find by the ſequel of Lewis the Fourteenth's hiſtory, that this diſcovery was of no manner of uſe to him, nor had the leaſt diſagreeable conſequence with reſpect to the holy fathers, whom it principally concerned. Hiſtory, and particularly that of the countries over which they preſide, is the compaſs by which Princes ſhould ſteer their government; and nothing more wicked, nothing more traiterous, than for their miniſters to keep them

them ignorant of any events, which have had either a good or evil influence on the government of their predeceſſors. One, indeed, could hardly treat a private ſubject more knaviſhly in the courſe of a literary education, than to ſuffer him to read no hiſtories of Britain but ſuch as that of *Pere d'Orleans*, Swift's four laſt years of the Queen, or ſome others of ſtill more modern date, where the wiſeſt and beſt of his fellow ſubjects, are repreſented as a wicked, factious, and unconſcionable crew, whilſt a dark ſhade, or a thick daub of falſe colour, is ſpread over the oppreſſions, provocations, and grievances, with which they were obliged to ſtruggle, or to entail ſlavery and bondage on their poſterity. But whither am I rambling? I was led into theſe reflections by the treatment I have obſerved theſe honeſt men have met with in print, who have thought proper to alarm their countrymen, by ſome ſpirited and affecting reſcripts in your Chronicle and other public papers, on the great and viſible encreaſe of popery, and the ſwarms of Jeſuits imported into theſe kindoms, ſince their proſcription from France and Portugal. Some of their anſwerers have had the modeſty to queſtion the fact; others, or perhaps the ſame men, ſpeak of it a matter of no moment, as if they not only had never read any but Lewis the Fourteenth's ſyſtem of hiſtory, but as if they walked about the world with bandages over their eyes, and their ears ſtuffed with cotton. Are then theſe vermin leſs pernicious in a proteſtant kingdom than in thoſe countries, whence even popiſh patriots have expelled them? So thought not William Duke of Brunſwick, an illuſtrious anceſtor

of

of our moſt gracious ſovereign; and who juſtly merited the character given him by Lundorp, of a lover of true religion, piety, and juſtice; an encourager of letters, and a munificent patron of thoſe who cultivated them; and who, to the honour of his ſagacity, expelled the *Jeſuits* from all the territories under his government, at a period when it was not apprehended they would do a thouſandth part of the miſchief of which the world has ſince found them capable. This is an anecdote little known to proteſtants, but well known to, and, as I am told, deeply reſented by the Jeſuits, and which no doubt they think of avenging in time and place, even to the *tenth* generation; as they did at Thorn in the year 1724, whence they had been ouſted much about the ſame time they were chaſed away by the noble Duke of Brunſwick. Let us attend to theſe precedents. Let us even ſeek for more, and enforce them to our indolent and inattentive countrymen. All the hiſtory of modern popery is not yet developed. Witneſs, Mr Baldwin, the affecting letter of the late worthy Biſhop of Wincheſter, in your Chronicle of Saturday the 4th inſtant. We ſtill want the ſequel to that intereſting piece of hiſtory. If room ſhould be left to ſurmiſe that nothing was done in conſequence of that moſt important remonſtrance at that critical time, would not a certain claſs of writers be apt to exult over the two worthy patriots, to whom the Biſhop's letter appears to have been addreſſed? No.—I think I dare venture to indemnify them againſt any reproach of that ſort. For among all the dirt that the miniſterial penmen of the preſent hour have thought proper to throw upon

upon them, there is not the leaſt intimation of their *too great lenity towards the papiſts*, though his late Majeſty's miniſtry were perhaps more vulnerable in that part than in any other. And the reaſon is plain. The *Ins* might be told, that there is ſome difference between *Connivance* and *Encouragement*, not to mention ſome other circumſtances, introduced by time and occurrences, which would not bear a compariſon between what *has been*, and what *now is*. Time is a great diſcoverer, and to that, for the preſent, let us leave it, not forgetting to look to ourſelves in the progreſs of a game where we have ſo much at ſtake. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A Plain-Dealing Proteſtant.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *June* 28, 1765.

IN the memorable year 1745, an honeſt Scotchman, at that time an inhabitant of the metropolis, who by no means found his account in the *doings* of his countrymen in the North, complained to an Iriſh acquaintance, of the coldneſs and jealouſy of the Engliſh towards the whole Scottiſh nation, and particularly of the difficulties he himſelf had found in ſtruggling with the prejudices which prevailed, during theſe commotions, againſt the very name of a Scotchman. The good-natured Iriſhman, who truly commiſerated the caſe of his friend, and was diſpoſed to relieve him, pro-

provided it might be done without his being out of pocket, replied, *Arrah, now my dear ſhoul, as I am a liefing chreſhtian, giff me haaſe a crone, and I will change coantries with you.* How variable is the courſe of exchange in traffic, of all kinds! If the bargain had been to make a few months, or even a few weeks ago, I am afraid the Iriſhman muſt not only have offered the premium, but muſt have advanced the price very conſiderably. It is not to be told what a drop of Scotch blood in an Engliſhman's veins might lately be worth, if it were but ſo much as would follow the prick of a lawn-needle. For my own part, I would, about Eaſter laſt, have ſooner given Mr. M-cph-rſ-n ten guineas for a pedigree deduced from Oſſian, than have paid ſix-pence at the Herald's Office, for the moſt authentic one derived from a Plantagenet. An acquaintance of mine in the ſaid Office wrote me word a-while ago, that if things continued upon their preſent footing, he did not doubt but he ſhould make his fortune by finding Caledonian anceſtors for expectants of all countries and complexions. We are remarkable in this county, Mr. Baldwin, for being fond of genealogies; and I remember the time when it was a part of our pride to be able to prove that not one of our forefathers, for ten generations backwards, was born on the North-ſide of Eſke. But about the beginning of a late Scotch millennium, a good old country parſon dying in this neighbourhood, his ſon, who was of the ſame cloth, and who eſtimated matters by a different balance, fetched a pedigree for the old Gentlemen from the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, and publiſhed it with great eclat in ſome

of

of the public papers. The project took, and a chaplainſhip was the conſequence, but whether to a ſhip or a regiment I have forgot. I could mention another, who by the ingenious expedient of dreſſing himſelf in a plaid and bonnet, and ſinging a few Scotch lilts, intituled himſelf to a comfortable penſion, till ſomething better could be done for him. At preſent I am informed, that the price of Scottiſh anceſtry is conſiderably abated, and that if the wiſhes and hopes of all honeſt men in the united kingdom ſhould take place, that kind of ſtock will quickly be below *par*; and, for aught that one knows, in leſs than a quarter of a year, one might purchaſe even the parſon's pedigree above-mentioned for ſo ſmall a trifle as the poor Iriſhman's half-crown. Even the Scots themſelves are beginning to deſpiſe and laugh at ſuch of the mercenary Engliſh as thus *Scotified* themſelves to obtain the favour of a man, who, had it depended upon the votes of his own countrymen, would have had his power confined to an iſland not an hundredth part as large as Great Britain. I mention this to the honour of many of that brave and generous nation, who have, in general, as high a reliſh for public liberty as any people upon earth, and perhaps never ſhewed it more than in the general joy there was in their country upon a late removal of a certain perſon from a poſt of the firſt conſequence in the Scotch police, and the promotion of another in his room, of a name and family ever auſpicious to the proteſtant ſettlement in the illuſtrious Houſes of Naſſau and Hanover, and ever determined againſt the tyrannical principles and attempts of the *Stuart*-race. It is now devoutly

to

to be wiſhed, and hoped, that real union will take place in the hearts of all honeſt well-wiſhers to the rights and liberties of Britiſh freemen on both ſides the Tweed; and that they, of all denominations, who have enriched themſelves with the plunder of their country, whether at home or abroad, will be made to diſgorge; and not be ſuffered with impunity to lay out their ill-gotten pelf in corrupting the people, and purchaſing the power of oppreſſing and inſlaving thoſe who were born to better fortunes, and happily educated in better principles than themſelves. I am,

SIR,

Carliſle, June 28, 1765. *Yours, &c.*

BRIGANTIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *July* 16, 1765.

THE account given by your correſpondent A. Z. in your Chronicle of June 29, concerning the Scotch medal*, having been extremely accep-

* "In the year 1711, the Ducheſs of Gordon, a Roman catholic, ſent about the latter end of June to Mr Robert "Bennet, dean of the faculty of advocates, a ſilver medal, "with a head on the right ſide, and this legend, *cujus eſt?* "and on the reverſe the Britiſh iſlands," with this motto, "*Reddite*, as a preſent to the faculty," which after ſome debate, "it was reſolved, by a majority of 63 againſt 12, to receive, "and that thanks ſhould be returned to her Grace by Mr "Dundaſs of Armiſton and Mr Home of Weſthall. *Tindal* "*contin.* octavo, 1758. vol. xvii. p. 394.

acceptable to many of your readers. I presume they who have not the histories at hand which make mention of it, may be desirous of knowing the sequel of that affair, and how these transactions in Scotland were relished at the British court. But before I transcribe the remaining part of this anecdote from *Tindal's Continuation of Rapin*, impartiality requires that we should supply an omission in A. Z.'s narrative, and do justice to another faculty in Scotland, I mean the faculty of divinity, concerning which Tindal writes as follows: "The timing of this transaction was likewise judged very remarkable; for it was soon "after the assembly of the kirk of Scotland had publicly declared themselves for the protestant succession in the house of Hanover; and their sense, "being justly taken for that of the bulk of the protestants in Scotland, whom they represent in an "ecclesiastical capacity, it seemed, the jacobite party thought it necessary to balance them by the "sense of the ministers of law and justice in that "country." Though Dr Tindal, or he from whom he takes this circumstance, may be thought to refine a little more than the headlong zeal of the jacobites to serve their cause, on all occasions, will admit of, yet the fact is a full and ample justification of a respectable body in that country, which ought to have been mentioned along with the other. This being premised, I proceed to exhibit the sequel of this impudent transaction.—Sir David Dalrymple, the Lord Advocate, gave an account of this proceeding to the Duke of "Queensberry, who dying about this time, the "information was laid before the Queen by one of "the

" the other ſecretaries; and the caſe was ſo fla-
" grant, that there was no avoiding to ſend the
" Lord Advocate orders to enquire into it. Upon
" which the faculty thought fit to diſown Dundaſs,
" Horne, and the other Advocate, in their addreſs
" concerning the medal, as done by a party at an
" occaſional meeting, and not by general conſent;
" declaring, by a ſolemn act, their affection to the
" Queen and her government, aud the proteſtant
" ſucceſſion, and their deteſtation of all practices
" tending to give any encouragement to the Pre-
" tender."

Permit me, Mr Baldwin, to pauſe here for a moment, and aſk, to what the ſincerity of this addreſſing faculty might be ſuppoſed to amount? I am afraid to very little; when we conſider the ſixty-three voices out of ſeventy-five, which were ſo lately in the oppoſite intereſt. But I chuſe not to diſcuſs this point with more preciſion, leſt I ſhould bring into queſtion the profeſſions of certain North Britiſh loyaliſts of the preſent hour; or perhaps render ſuſpected the public declarations of the kirk aſſembly above-mentioned. I therefore go on with the hiſtory without any farther digreſſion.

" It was for ſome time matter of doubt, whether
" the government would be ſatisfied with this act
" of the faculty. But the court thought fit to
" make no farther inquiry into that affair. This
" lenity imboldened Dundaſs to write a vindica-
" tion more treaſonable, if poſſible, than their
" proceedings about the medal: But, before the
" publication, the printer carried the copy of it
" to the Lord Provoſt of Edinburgh, who commu-
" nicated

" nicated it to Sir James Stuart, and he took care " that the Queen and Council ſhould be informed " of it: Upon which the paper was entirely ſup- " preſſed. And Monſieur de Kreyenberg, Reſi- " dent from the Elector of Hanover, having, by " expreſs orders, preſented a memorial for the pro- " ſecution of Dundaſs and his aſſociates, the go- " vernment thought proper to remove Sir David " Dalrymple from his office of Lord Advocate, on " pretence that he had been too remiſs in proſe- " cuting the Scots medaliſts, and reinſtated Sir " James Stuart in that poſt, on account of his zeal " in ſuppreſſing Dundaſs's vindication. Though " this gave ſome ſatisfaction to the friends of the " proteſtant ſucceſſion, yet it is obſervable, that " Sir David Dalrymple was ſo far from being an " enemy to it, that (as his particular acquaintance " affirmed) he would have proſecuted the medaliſts " with greater ſeverity than any whatever, had he " not received ſecret inſtructions from *a great man* " *at court*, not to ſtir in the affair."

I confeſs the conduct of ſuch men as theſe ſhould not be drawn into a pretence for ſuſpecting others, whoſe actions are not ſo open and flagrant. Nevertheleſs, hiſtories of this kind are extremely uſeful to put us upon our guard; and the friends of the Houſe of Hanover have reaſon to be thankful at any period, for being taken out of the hands of men who betray the remoteſt inclination to act the part of theſe medaliſts, and their abettors, would have done, be they Scots or Engliſhmen. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A BORDERER.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *July* 30, 1765.

I AM a poor unfortunate fellow, who, after various unſucceſsful trials in the world, have been obliged to take refuge in the trade of an author, and have accordingly put my firſt performance, in that way, to the preſs. Upon talking with my Bookſeller about *terms*, he told me, that the ſale of my piece would depend a good deal upon the ſentence paſſed upon it by certain critics, who undertake, once a month, to ſet the public right in their judgment concerning the publications of the day. His deſcription of theſe formidable men ſtruck me ſo ſenſibly with a mortal fright, that I did not loſe the impreſſion for a minute the whole evening, and when I went to bed, was haunted with the following viſion. Methought my Bookſeller called upon me one morning, and told me it was time to go to *Purgatory*. Upon which I aroſe and followed him, and having paſſed a few ſtreets and turnings, was led by him into a dirty, but ſpacious hall, where were multitudes of anxious countenances, upon the ſame errand with myſelf. About the middle of this hall was ſeated a venerable figure, in a large faculty-wig, having on the table, which ſupported his arm, a cat-o'nine-tails, a fly-flap, a gooſe's feather, and a ſyringe, with a number of attendants, who ſeemed to be retainers to the profeſſion. Below this Gentleman, on the oppoſite ſide, ſat an old Lady-

critic, attended by a ſolitary figure, not unlike the Apothecary in Shakeſpeare. This female zoiliſt had likewiſe her implements of correction as well as the man, and was ſo placed, that had the male critic been inclined to let any poor devil of an author paſs by him unnoticed, he could not eſcape the claws of the beldame. The firſt who was called to audience happened to be a Lord, who, ſpeaking in a particular dialect, had the good fortune to receive a compliment, and a tickle of the feather, from the preſiding critic; and, though he declared, "His Lordſhip delivered himſelf in "*pretty language*, acknowledged he was utterly at "a loſs for his meaning;" and as the Lady was probably unaffected by the brogue, as well as unedified by his ſenſe, he was ſuffered to paſs by her without any ſort of remark. The next that came in review was an hiſtorian, who felt the ſmart of the cat-o'nine-tails applied by the Doctor with no little vigour; but having paſſed through his hands, he had the luck to meet with a better reception from the Lady, who, to re-eſtabliſh his ſpirits, diſcompoſed with the diſcipline, kindly gave him a dram. Next followed *Triſtram Shandy*, who was immediately ſeized by the waiſtband of his breeches, whilſt an operator in waiting was preparing the ſyringe for an enematic injection. The patient, however, delivering himſelf by a ſudden twitch, and as ſudden a diſcharge from his trowſers, the critic was obliged to give back, not without applying his handkerchief to his noſe. The humanity of the woman-critic on this occaſion was laudable. Paſſing by all forms of delicacy, ſhe offered her ſervice to accompany the hapleſs noveliſt into an

adjoining apartment, and to accommodate him, as occaſion ſhould require, with a freſh ſhirt, and a pair of clean breeches of her huſband's. After *Triſtram*, appeared the celebrated *Ch. Churchill*, who no ſooner advanced before the groupe, but the whole band of critics of both families was up in arms. The whip, the ſyringe, the flap, with ſtinkpots of various compoſitions, were wielded by ſome or other of the fraternity, and not a ſingle hand unoccupied by ſome implement of annoyance. The intrepid bard marched on with the dignity and indifference of a Spaniard, till the firſt party of critics being within the ſwing of his cudgel, the whole apparatus was diſconcerted in a moment, and the operators laid ſprawling hand over head. He contented himſelf with toſſing his *quid* in the face of the critickeſs, but lent her apothecary ſuch a thwack over his ſhoulders, as made him cry for mercy, and ſwear he had always taken him for the beſt poet in the three kingdoms. When matters were pretty well recompoſed, a reverend figure aroſe, and begun his proceſſion in party-coloured canonicals. He was received with lowly reverences by both parties, but without his taking the leaſt notice of either, which might probably be the occaſion, that when his back was turned, I could obſerve the maſter-critic flirting out his tongue, and the attendants making various grimaces, as ſchool-boys uſe to do when they get on the blind ſide of their maſter. One incident was pleaſant enough: A puny writer, who *eſtimated* how things would go, thought of availing himſelf of the certain impunity of his ſuperior officer, and with that view would needs perform the part of *train-bearer:*

But no ſooner was the principal paſſed by, and this weaſel-figure come within reach, but the periwig'd critic ſaluted him with a kick on the breech, which was likewiſe repeated by the old woman's apothecary. To be more particular, Mr. Baldwin, would be endleſs and tedious, and exceed the bounds preſcribed to your correſpondents. I muſt therefore now confine myſelf to a few general obſervations. I could obſerve, that the fly-flap and feather were chiefly uſed by the ſupreme critic, in the caſe of Scotch authors, defenders of the late miniſtry, and ſome few poeteſſes and female noveliſts. On the other hand, the many-thonged whip was liberally exerciſed upon all whig writers, without exception. I was ſome time in finding out the uſe of the ſyringe, the operator who played it ſtanding behind a curtain, till I perceived the contents to be generally diſcharged upon thoſe from whom ſome retaliation was to be apprehended, which left the preſident room to deny his being concerned in the inſult, in caſe of accuſation. I could obſerve, that the female was often at a loſs how to deal with party-writers. Sometimes ſhe offered her ſnuff-box to a whig, and ſometimes to a tory; not ſeldom ſhe ſquinted two ways at once, and while on one ſide ſhe was regaling a majority or a minority-man with her dram-bottle, the *Charlatan* had his cue to aſſault his poſteriors with a corking pin. In many caſes the author was preceded by his book-ſeller, who failed not to whiſper ſomething to the great wig, and dexterouſly enough to ſlip half a piece, and ſometimes a whole one, into the old woman's hand; the effect of which was a nod of approbation to the author, and ſometimes a touch with

with the feather. It was very ſeldom that the ſame author was either careſſed or mal-treated by both ſets of critics; he who got a *bene diſceſſit* from the doctor, generally ſpeaking, ſuffered under the old Lady's talons; on the contrary, ſhe had plaiſters for the backs of many wretched wights, who had been half-flead by the cat-o'nine-tails at the upper table; excepting retainers to the phyſicline, who commonly ſuffered without any mercy from either quarter. It now only remains, Mr. *Baldwin*, to relate my own deſtiny. I am of the tribe of politicians, and would gladly have prevailed with my bookſeller to be my *vaunt guard*, but could not. At length, taking heart of grace, I began my march towards the tribunal; but an unlucky whelp in the crowd calling out, *a minority-man*, the furious periwig'd monarch, without ever looking in my face, ſeized the whip, to which I had certainly fallen a martyr, had not, at that auſpicious moment, a general cry been echoed through the dome, of *a new miniſtry, a new miniſtry*. This was no ſooner heard, than the maſter-critic turned as pale as aſhes, ſtarted from his ſeat, and throwing his ſcourge violently on the floor, uttered with great vehemence, *Zoons—my penſion!* The old Lady clapped on her maſk, loaded *pickle-herring* with her trinkets, and moved off with great compoſure. But the riot increaſing, and tables, benches, and other moveables, being overturned with hideous noiſe and clamour, my ſlumbers were broke, and the baſeleſs fabric of my viſion vaniſhed in an inſtant. I am, Sir, *Yours, &c.*

ONEIROCRITICUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Aug.* 8, 1765.

DR. Heylin, in his Life of Archbiſhop Laud, ſpeaking of thoſe who were driven to New England to avoid the perſecution ſet on foot by the Prelates, tells us, "They were not much taken "notice of at the firſt, when they were few in "number, and inconſiderable for their power. "But growing up ſo faſt, both in ſtrength and "multitude, they began to carry a face of danger. "For, ſays he, how unſafe muſt it be thought, "both to church and ſtate, to ſuffer ſuch a conſtant "receptacle of diſcontented, dangerous, and *ſchiſ-* "*matical* perſons to grow ſo faſt; from whence, "as from the bowels of the Trojan horſe, ſo many "incendiaries might break out to inflame the "nation!" If one may judge from ſome mortifications put upon our coloniſts for two years paſt, the late miniſtry may ſeem to have been ſeized with a panic of the ſame ſort, and to have done their utmoſt to keep down the *dangerous growth* by expedients of humiliation, which might perhaps have anſwered the end of the *ſtate*, if there had not been ſtill remaining among our modern coloniſts ſo much of that old *ſchiſmatical* leaven of their forefathers, which never could be brought under but by *church authority*. "And therefore it was, as "we are informed by the ſame hiſtorian, that, to "prevent ſuch miſchiefs as might thence enſue, it "was under conſultation of the *chief phyſicians*, "who

" who were to take especial care of the church's " health, to send a BISHOP over to them for their " better government, and back him with some " forces to *compel*, if he were not otherwise able to " *persuade*, obedience." But happily for these emigrants, the Scotch troubles breaking out, found his Grace of Canterbury other employment. It is an unlucky coincidence enough of the politics of the two periods, that while our late statesmen were laying incumbrances on our colonies of the *civil* kind, our *ecclesiastical physicians* should be projecting to send them BISHOPS for their *better government*. Indeed, a certain late writer, who informs us how these Colony-Bishops were to be employed, makes no mention of any *forces to back them*; but *forces* being at hand for other purposes, they might soon be called in, whenever the *schismatics* should run restive, or refuse to ply under the correction of spiritual censures. To be serious, I could heartily have wished the project of episcopizing our colonies had been planned after a better pattern. In both cases, the state and the church seem to have co-operated in the hopeful work of humbling the colonists: But which of them, in the modern instance, began it, is not quite so clear. Some time ago there appeared, in the public prints, a letter dated from Boston in New England, complaining, " That a public-spirited proposal, to provide for " the christian instruction of the neighbouring In- " dians, had proved abortive, for want of a proper " sanction from the mother country;" which, it seems, was refused. As the plan proposed was to have been executed and supported, without any episcopal aid whatsoever, it was natural enough

to aſcribe the diſappointment of it to the interpoſition of ſome powerful churchmen, who do not chooſe, generally ſpeaking, that the influence of a prelacy ſhould be dropped, wherever the eſtabliſhment of religion comes in queſtion. But the advocates for a certain epiſcopal ſociety, thought fit to deny the charge, and to lay the miſcarriage of this truly chriſtian deſign at the door of ſome *laymen* acting in the department of *trade*, who were ſaid to have diſcovered, in the propoſals of the undertakers, ſomething detrimental to the commercial intereſts of other communities on the ſame continent. Whether there was really any foundation for this pretence or not, it anſwered the preſent purpoſe, and kept the world from ſeeing, that the Indians might be chriſtianized without epiſcopal miſſions, and conſequently removed *one* obſtruction to the darling project of epiſcopizing our colonies; which, if we may believe ſome people, who ſhould know, would certainly have taken place, in caſe the late miniſtry had ſurvived the next ſeſſion of parliament. This appears the more probable from the publication of a late book, written, or at leaſt fathered, by one of the church of England miſſionaries, wherein every lenient artifice is employed to reconcile the coloniſts, of different perſuaſions, to the tender mercies and moderation of epiſcopal government. But *in vain is the net ſpread in the ſight of the bird.* Nothing more evident to any man of common ſenſe, than that the *ſeemingly* limited powers of the projected prelacy, deſcribed in that pamphlet, might be extended to many grievous inſtances of oppreſſion, without any *appearance* that theſe Biſhops exceeded their com-

commiſſion. Of this the coloniſts of every anti-epiſcopal perſuaſion are perfectly convinced, and therefore are not likely to conſent (without *forces* to *compel* obedience) to the eſtabliſhment of a prelatical hierarchy among them; well knowing, that where epiſcopal power once gets in a finger, it will ſoon make way for the hand and the arm; and, by degrees, for the whole body. But, thanks to a kind providence, and a gracious Sovereign, our fellow-ſubjects in theſe remote provinces are not *now* likely to be put to any farther proof of their patience: The preſent adminiſtration ſeem to turn their firſt attention where it is moſt neceſſary; namely, to the *unedifying* condition in which their predeceſſors have left our colony-intereſts; and will, no doubt, endeavour to heal every wound in thoſe quarters, and not only provide ſuch political and commercial remedies, as may perfectly re-eſtabliſh the mutual intereſt and confidence of our coloniſts, and their mother country, but will likewiſe effectually eaſe them of their apprehenſions of being interfered with in their forms of religious worſhip and diſcipline, and particularly of being diſturbed and hampered by the introduction of epiſcopal formalities, where, with reſpect to the true ends of religion, they can do nothing but miſchief. Such at leaſt are the hopes of all well-wiſhers to public liberty and true religion at home and abroad, who can ſee no obligation the preſent miniſters are under to adminiſter every bolus preſcribed by our eccleſiaſtical phyſicians, many of whom, on the commencement of a late *millenium*, were ſo nimble in their evolution *to the right about*, compelled, as they were, by that and ſome concomitant *manœu-*

vres, to turn tails, moſt unpolitely, upon their chief benefactors. It is a good omen too, that the premiers of the faculty have but ſmall hopes, in the preſent ſtate of things, of epiſcopizing the American continent, in that the late *reviewer* of ſome colony *remarks*, deſtined, as the world ſays, to the firſt propagating mitre, hath condeſcended to take up with a good Engliſh benefice in reward for his ſervices and ſufferings, upon a prognoſtic, taken from the face of affairs, that he might cool his heels long enough in a certain anti-chamber, before his *Congé d'Elire* would paſs the ſeals. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

PHILOCOLONUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 19, 1765.

THE late Mr. Trenchard often inſiſted among his friends, that next to bribery and corruption among the lay members of the civil community, nothing would endanger the liberty of England more than the increaſing power and opulence of the clergy. "Indeed, would he ſay, I ſometimes "look upon the latter as the worſe evil of the two. "The funds that ſupply the demands of corruption "muſt in time be exhauſted; but the revenues of "the church being daily accumulating, and becom-"ing, as they accrue, *unalienable*, our poſterity "may look for a return of the ſame ſlavery of con-"ſcience,

"science, with all its horrible attendants which "church tyranny brought forth in the darkeſt "times of popery, with this melancholy difference, "that the yoke of a Pope, ſeated in our own "country, with all his myrmidons about him, will "not be ſo eaſily ſhaken off as it was when the "Pope was no nearer than Rome." What gave occaſion to theſe reflections, were the various attempts made, by the ſuperior clergy in Mr. Trenchard's time, to extend their power and influence, which, though diſappointed for the time, were perhaps never ſince *quite* laid aſide by their ſucceſſors: And if one may not ſay, that the prophecy of this ſagacious politician is *even now* in a likely way to be fulfilled, it muſt be owned at leaſt, that the conduct of the preſent clergy does not at all contribute to eaſe their contemporaries of the apprehenſion that this may be *one day* the caſe. Among other tokens of this approaching criſis, it is none of the moſt obſcure, that the eſtabliſhed clergy have not always diſcountenanced, but vehemently oppoſed any propoſals for altering ſuch paſſages in our public forms of doctrine and worſhip, as are but too plainly allied to the errors and uſurpations of popery: For the preſent I ſhall only give one inſtance. The firſt clauſe of the twentieth of our articles of religion aſſerts, that *the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controverſies of faith.* But whence hath the church this power? Or by what argument will the church of England prove her title to it, which will not equally conclude in favour of the church of Rome, and which will not oblige the church of England, as the younger ſiſter, to receive all the doc-

doctrines, rites, and ceremonies, *decreed* in the popiſh canons? But neither, indeed, hath the church of England this power and authority *de facto*; for, thanks to the civil powers, and the genius of the Britiſh legiſlature, the church, as ſuch, is precluded from *exerciſing* any ſuch power or authority in the ſmalleſt article. Why then is this clauſe ſuffered to ſtand in our public confeſſion? And why is every clergyman, and every perſon who takes an academical degree, in law or in phyſic, as well as in divinity, obliged to ſubſcribe his aſſent, *ex animo*, to ſo manifeſt a falſehood? Can any reaſon be given for this, but that the clergy think good to keep up their *claim* to this authority, againſt the time when the civil reſtraints upon the exerciſe of it ſhall be taken away? Or till the clergy ſhall become too powerful to regard whether they are taken away or not? But ſoft and fair: May I not be all this while reckoning without my hoſt? Is it quite a clear caſe, that this power and authority are not exerciſed by the church of England? It ſhould ſeem not, by a paſſage in a pamphlet publiſhed this very year, by one Mr. Apthorp, in anſwer to ſome remarks of Dr. Mayhew of New England. "The objections (ſays this reverend Gentle-"man, p. 13.) to the power and authority of the "church, reſpecting rites, ceremonies, and con-"troverſies of faith, are *at preſent* urged with a "very ill grace, when that power is ſo cautiouſly "exerciſed." *Cautiouſly* exerciſed! Is it then exerciſed *at all?* The public knows nothing of any ſuch exerciſe, nor do the laws of this proteſtant country allow of it. If, indeed, by the word *cautiouſly*, this Gentleman means *privately* or *ſecretly*, the

the thing is poſſible, but not quite credible. Candidates for orders, inſtitutions, diſpenſations, &c. who are of *ſuſpected orthodoxy*, may be examined, ſifted, and twiſted into conformities in little agreement with their inward ſentiments, and, conſidering that their bread may depend upon their compliance, may ſubmit to authoritative impoſitions beyond the demands of the law; and all this may be done ſo *cautiouſly*, that not above one in ten thouſand ſhall ever hear of it: But this *exerciſe* of church-authority, hath ſo much the air of an inquiſition, and the more for being *cautiouſly* practiſed, that no one, who is at all acquainted with the moderation of thoſe worthy and venerable perſonages who preſide in this department of authority, can eaſily believe a ſyllable of it. And, yet, why ſhould we not believe Mr. Apthorp? He is a Gentleman of a fair reputation, and is ſaid to have very reſpectable connections; and may know inſtances of which the public is ignorant; inſtances, perhaps, where church-authority is *cautiouſly* exerciſed, in ſome way different from that ſuggeſted above. Be that as it may, if there are any ſuch inſtances upon record on this ſide the revolution, they will afford a very ſufficient motive for the public to watch the motions of the clergy, and to ſet reaſonable bounds in time to thoſe means which have given ſtrength and ſinews to the enormous power of the Romiſh Babylon. The ſpirit of popery may be where the modes of her particular ſuperſtition are not: And however *cautiouſly* inſtances of the exerciſe of church-authority may, for the preſent, be concealed, ſhould the church of England ever avail herſelf ſo far of her *alliance* with

with the ſtate, as to be the predominant ingredient, thoſe inſtances would infallibly be brought forth as evidence of an *independent* authority, and as legitimate precedents for the public exerciſe of that very power, which is now ſo *cautiouſly* reſtrained. I am aware that I ſhall be told, that the firſt clauſe of our twentieth article of religion is confirmed by act of parliament: For an anſwer to this objection, I muſt beg a little room in another of your papers; when I ſhall ſhew, from the teſtimony of Archbiſhop Laud himſelf, that this is by no means the caſe.

I am, SIR,

Your old friend and humble ſervant,

PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 24, 1765.

IN your Chronicle of September 12, you have favoured your readers with a curious extract from a late Dedication, wherein it is queſtioned, whether "the adminiſtration of public juſtice in "England, (which, we are told, runs as pure as "where neareſt its celeſtial ſource) is to be aſcribed "to the interpoſing hand of providence, or to ſome "hidden force, ſome peculiar virtue in the eſſential "parts, or in the well-adapted frame of our excel-"lent conſtitution." The queſtion, I apprehend, had been more ready for an anſwer, had we been told, *what* providence is here meant. The learned dedicator hath, on another occaſion, told the com-

mu-

munity, that "the political ſyſtem has nothing "but the providence of government (contradiſtin-"guiſhed from the omnipotent hand of providence) "to ſuſtain it againſt its own madneſs from falling "into anarchy." It will, I ſuppoſe, be readily granted, that the adminiſtration of public juſtice, is part of the political ſyſtem, and even one branch of government. What need then of any farther doubt? The adminiſtration of public juſtice ſuſtains itſelf by *its own* providence. And, for aught I know, this kind of divinity may help us to as commodious an account of the conduct of Ariſtophanes, as that more refined one of the learned dedicator. Ariſtophanes kept his fingers from meddling with the civil judicature of Athens, at the ſame time that he made extremely free with the *eſtabliſhed gods*: Well knowing, that the *providence* of a Lord Chief Juſtice, or an Attorney General of the Areopagus, would certainly have laid him by the heels for his wit, while his *faith*, moſt probably, did not carry him to any great degree of fear and reverence for the *providence* of the *eſtabliſhed gods*.

Mention is made, Mr. Baldwin, in the ſame extract, of the *heroic* moderation of Eraſmus. Doctors differ about this *moderation*. Take the character of it from the pen of a very late writer, who ſeems to have ſtudied Eraſmus with as much impartiality at leaſt as the learned dedicator. "Eraſmus, ſays "this author, with all Luther's convictions upon "his mind, could never bring himſelf nearer a "reformation than ſome ſatyrical ſtrokes upon the "ſtupidity and impoſtures of monkery, ſevere "enough indeed in ſome inſtances, but of no great "ſignificance from the pen of ſuch a writer, who

"idol-

"idolized the Pope, and the great churchmen of "his time, the patrons and upholders of every re-"ligious abuse and corruption, *with the most abject* "*adulation.*"—I therefore second the learned dedicator, in recommending Erasmus's motto to all great men, who, like him, are *sent for the times.* ACAS CIRCUMSPECTISSIME. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

PARADOXUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Sept.* 24, 1765.

IN a monthly magazine for last *August*, there appeared, *A particular and authentic account of the escape of* Charles Edward Stuart, *commonly called the* Young Chevalier, *after the battle of* Culloden*, accompanied with notice to the public, that a *third* edition of that narrative has just made its appearance. Who they are that have had the care of that *third* edition will not be hard to guess, with all the warnings and instances before us, which the friends of his Majesty's protestant government are daily giving us of the impudence of the papists, and the unrestrained methods they are taking to strengthen their hands by the accession of new converts. The tale is artfully told, and by a fast friend to the hero of it, not only with circumstances calculated to move compassion, but with plain insinuations of a kind providence in providing

* *Vide* Gentleman's Magazine, *Aug.* 1765.

ding miraculouſly for the eſcape of a fugitive, who might poſſibly be reſerved for thoſe *better times*, which the jeſuited catholics of England have never had out of their eye. What muſt the proteſtant reader think of a publication, which gives the epithets of *truſty*, *faithful*, *hoſpitable*, &c. to men and women, for overt acts of the groſſeſt treaſon againſt their Sovereign, and for entertaining, protecting, and concealing from juſtice a deſperate wretch, who had filled their country with confuſion, rapine and blood, and all for the laudable purpoſe of ſubverting the liberties of a free people, and introducing all the horrors of a bloody ſuperſtition, which never yet ſpared man, woman, nor child, who would not ſubmit to its tyranny, wherever or whenever it had the power to exerciſe it? I would aſk the magazine-man, what could be *his* motive for diſperſing this idle romance (for perhaps it is no better) *at this time*, into a thouſand or more places, where perhaps the pamphlet from which it is taken would never have been ſeen or heard of? Has he any patrons who expect this kind of ſervice from him? He makes a ſort of apology for "neglecting to take this narrative into "his miſcellany, when the fact was recent." It had been more to his purpoſe to have told his well affected fellow-ſubjects, why he takes it in *now*. I have been credibly informed, that this narrative was offered to the proprietor of that miſcellany (who was a loyal and affectionate ſubject to the royal family on the throne) when the affair was freſh; and that he abſolutely refuſed it. On the other hand I know that a reſcript which was ſent to the publiſher of that miſcellany within the laſt

ſixteen

ſixteen months, was ſuppreſſed and never appeared in it; for no other *imaginable* reaſon but that it bore hard upon the papiſts. I would not cauſeleſsly inſinuate any thing to the diſadvantage of the publiſhers or proprietors of that magazine. I know them not. And perhaps a lucrative view of inriching their collection might be their only motive. But in that caſe, either their judgment muſt be very ſlender, or materials muſt run very low with them when they are driven to the neceſſity of taking in a tale, which being obſolete and ſtale, cannot be ſuppoſed to be revived, with any view but that very bad one of corrupting the loyalty of his Majeſty's ſubjects. Facts of this kind, Mr. Baldwin, are of importance to the public, and are more worthy to be pointed out, than a thouſand political anecdotes, which are toſſed about, between the INS and the OUTS. I make no court in the preſent caſe to your impartiality. My ſubject is the common cauſe of every proteſtant Engliſhman in the kingdom. And the conſtant conduct of your paper upon the principles of liberty and loyalty, will not ſuffer me to doubt for a ſingle moment, but that I ſhall ſee this letter in your Chronicle the firſt opportunity you have of making room for it. I am,

Yours, &c.

An unchangeable Whig.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Oct.* 26, 1765.

IN the reign of Philip and Mary matters of government were upon ſuch a footing, that I ſuppoſe few of the preſent generation would expect to find any traces of thoſe generous ſentiments of public liberty, which ſubſequent ages have brought forth. I beg leave therefore to entertain your readers with a quotation from a book publiſhed in the reign of Queen Mary, in the year 1556, which is not only a curioſity in reſpect of the times, and the quality of the author, but an uſeful admonition to the preſent generation in more lights than one.

" In public matters of a realm, which concern " all and every man's life, wife, children, lands, " goods, and whatſoever cannot be treated upon " by all men, but all muſt put their truſt in a " few; men ought to be wiſe and circumſpect " whom they truſt; for there be too many who " paſs not what become of their neighbours, ſo " they may proſper themſelves; what become of " the whole realm, ſo their own families may ſtand " ſtill. He that maketh ſuit to be a deputy for a " multitude, ſeemeth to ſue for his own vain-glory " or profit. Thoſe that ſend letters not to chuſe " this man, but to chuſe ſuch a man; have in " their heads more than the univerſal wealth of " all. He that bringeth letters to be preferred,"

" mean-

" meaneth not the benefit of them that he would " ſerve. He that giveth money and maketh great " feaſts, thinketh ſome other fetch than the ſervice " of his neighbours. He that refuſeth or releaſeth " his ordinary wages, looketh for ſome greater ex- " traordinary reward. He that is always or oft " at *Princes'* Flatters, or in *Practiſers'* Palaces, " cannot long continue *the people's true profter.* " Now, if nature, reaſon, honeſty, and law, do " grievouſly puniſh him, and caſt him out of all " honeſt men's companies, that is negligent in a " trifle, how much more ought he to be puniſhed, " and caſt out of all men's ſight, that is negligent " in the greateſt matters? If he ought ſharply to " be uſed, that deceiveth one poor man, how " much more ſharply ought he to be puniſhed, and " of all men to be abhorred, yea caſt to the dogs, " that deceiveth a whole realm of ten or twenty " hundred thouſand perſons? If judgment be given " againſt a man, that ſeeketh his own gain with " the loſs of his friends in ſmall things, what opi- " nion may men have, what judgment ſhall be " given of thoſe, that, to make themſelves noble " and rich, cut the throats of thoſe that commit- " ted themſelves, their wives, their children, their " goods, yea, and lives, upon truſt, into their " hands?"

This citation is from *A ſhort Treatiſe of Politique Power*, written by Biſhop Poynet, at the period above-mentioned. It ſhould ſeem we have no ſuch *deputies* now ſubſiſting in the realm: Otherwiſe ſome pious Biſhop or other would be giving us the like warning. But *deputies* are frail and fallible men as well as others, and therefore inſtead

inſtead of attending to the Sejanians, Anti-Sejanians, Novocaſtrians, Pittians, or any other denomination, let us try individuals by good Biſhop Poynet's characteriſtic of good and bad *deputies*, and diſcard ſuch as will not ſtand the teſt, whether he be *Trojan* or *Rutilian* in name. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

PHILAGATHUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 19, 1765.

I Was not at all ſurprized to ſee the *ſecond part* of the *young Pretender's Eſcape**, retailed in a certain *magazine* already noted, without the leaſt word of apology or defence for publiſhing the *firſt*. For what could the compilers do? To have taken ſhame to themſelves, and to have acknowledged their fault, had been utterly inconſiſtent with publiſhing a ſecond part of that obnoxious tale. On another hand, to have ſuppreſſed the ſecond part, would have depreciated their pamphlet ſo much in the eſtimation of ſome ſorts of their readers, that their reſpect for our gracious Sovereign on the throne, would not have been a ſufficient apology to thoſe whoſe curioſity was ſo ſharp ſet, to know what became of the poor unfortunate *Adventurer*. I hope, however, they will grow wiſer for the future, and avoid the reproach of ſerving a cauſe which can never ſucceed but by the deſtruction of every

* *Vide* Gentleman's Magazine, *Oct.* 1765.

every thing dear to Britiſh proteſtants. I turn from them therefore for the preſent, to ſome more general remarks upon certain hiſtorical writings, and their conſequences, which have appeared among us for ſome years backwards. In the days of the late miniſtry, many honeſt men, who had attended to the news of the literary world, were ſtruck with ſurprize at the ſeveral miniſterial attacks upon public liberty, as well as at the ſort of men who were taken into places of the firſt confidence. It looked to them like aw king out of a dream, to find our conſtitutional policy ſo changed all of a ſudden, and to ſee the priſons and the pillory employed with little more reaſon and propriety than they were before the *revolution*. But ſerious and obſerving men had ſeen the way paving for the ſmoother progreſs of theſe politics for ſome years. They remarked in what manner the faults of the Stuart-race had been gloſſed over, how the reformation had been depreciated and calumniated, the revolution vilified, and even the ſucceſs at Culloden ſneered at, and the glorious inſtruments of them abuſed, in voluminous hiſtories of England, which were puffed out with the moſt fulſome encomiums, and rendered cheap enough for the pockets of all readers, but thoſe of the very loweſt rank. It was remarked that to help forward the good work, Swift's hiſtory of the four laſt years of Queen Anne made its appearance at a critical time when, as might eaſily be perceived, it would make the ſtrongeſt impreſſions. To theſe I could add a long liſt from the time that the cauſe of the Stuarts was firſt recommended to public compaſſion, down to the late impudent and ly-

ing

ing hiſtory of Cardinal Pole. Some of theſe writers were penſioned by the Thane, and his (now anti, but then) Profejanians, who, however, have not changed their complexion, as appears by the Antifejanus in your Chronicle of October 29, who is full of his lamentations at the ſtirs in the colonies, the riotous efforts to repeal the cyde-act, as well as the licentiouſneſs of the people in general on other occaſions at home; inſenſible you may be ſure not only of the proverb, that *oppreſſion makes wiſe men mad*, but likewiſe that theſe are the precious fruits of the wiſdom and policy of himſelf and his delicious yoke-fellows. But not to take up too much of your room, I will only add, what was ſaid in my hearing by one of the ableſt men, and of the moſt warm-hearted patriots in the kingdom, namely, that Mrs. Maccaulay's hiſtory was one of the moſt ſeaſonable as well as valuable productions of the preſent age, and that it is a thouſand pities it ſhould not be publiſhed in a form and ſize reaſonable enough to be purchaſed by the middling ſort of capable readers, to counteract the poiſon inſtilled into their minds by other *complete* romances, ſo much in faſhion at a late Æra.—It ſhould ſeem, however, that ſome of our writers are determined, that this excellent hiſtory ſhall not have too clear a ſtage, and have therefore contrived to out face it with the ſad and lamentable tragedy of Charles I.

I am, SIR, &c.

An unchangeable Whig.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Nov.* 30, 1765.

IN one of the public prints of Nov. 18, it is ſaid, "that it has been generally, though perhaps "erroneouſly believed, that in conſideration of the "neceſſary great diſtance of the places of reſidence "of foreign miniſters from the eaſtern ſide of the "bridge, where all ſhips muſt lie, government has "tolerated one or two places of worſhip, for the "better accomodation of foreign papiſts, *under the* "*protection of foreign miniſters.*"—If this be true, how much matters are altered among us, the following tranſaction, which you are deſired to publiſh as ſoon as conveniently you can, will ſufficiently declare.

December 6, 1745. His Majeſty King GEORGE the Second iſſued a proclamation, for putting the laws in execution againſt jeſuits and popiſh prieſts, &c. In conſequence of this proclamation, on Tueſday, Dec. 10, Mr. De Veil iſſued his warrant to apprehend James Hamilton, who produced a protection from the Venetian Embaſſador, and ſent it to Juſtice De Veil for his inſpection by two Gentlemen; to whom that worthy and active magiſtrate declared, *He would pay no regard to it.* And the conſtables, being the next day in queſt of the ſaid Hamilton, and being put in mind of the protection, proteſted to the people of the houſe where Hamilton lodged, that as the ſaid prieſt was a ſub-

ſubject of Great Britain, they would take him even out of the Venetian Ambaſſador's own houſe. On this occaſion a long letter was written to his Majeſty's Secretaries of State (of whom the preſent Duke of Newcaſtle was one) and ſubſcribed by no leſs than *eight* miniſters of the ſeveral Roman catholic Princes and States then reſiding in England, remonſtrating againſt the proceedings of the Juſtice of the Peace, and the Conſtables, as well as the clauſe in the proclamation, which gave riſe to them, and proteſting againſt the whole, as a violation of the law of nations. To this letter, the Secretaries of State returned a ſpirited and proper anſwer, aſſerting his Majeſty's right over his own ſubjects, with reſpect to the matter in queſtion, in an irrefragable manner, both from the law of nations, and the laws of Great Britain. With reſpect to the declarations of the Juſtice of Peace and the Conſtables, the ſaid Secretaries promiſed, that *proper inquiries ſhould be made, in order to give ſuch ſatisfaction to the Venetian Ambaſſador, as ſhould appear to be due.* But, indeed, the letter of the Secretaries themſelves had precluded all *ſatisfaction* in this caſe, and fully juſtified both the Juſtice and the Conſtables, by referring their Excellencies to an act of the 11th and 12th of William III. wherein it is expreſsly declared, "that no ſubject of the "King's, whether natural born, or naturaliſed, "may celebrate maſs even in the houſes of foreign "miniſters; and the names and places of nativity "even of the foreign prieſts whom they ſhall make "uſe of, ſhall be regiſtered in the office of the "principal Secretary of State." To this ſtate of the caſe I ſhall only ſubjoin one or two expoſtula-

tions from the Secretaries letter, which, perhaps, might not have been unſeaſonable in ſome *late periods*. " Are not open chapels maintained under " colour of public protection, with an *enormous* " number of prieſts, out of the houſes of the mini- " ſters who lend their names to them? Is it for " the uſe of the miniſters family that maſs is there- " in celebrated from morning to night, or rather " for the ſake of furniſhing his Majeſties *converted* " *ſubjects* with opportunities of being preſent at it " againſt law? Is there any Roman catholic country " where ſuch an extenſion of their privileges is al- " lowed to proteſtant miniſters? Is there any ſuch " thing practiſed at Vienna, at Paris, or Madrid?" As, therefore, the laws of nature, nations, and of the land, ſtand juſt as they did twenty-five years ago, and as circumſtances are the ſame with reſpect to the caſe in queſtion, that they were then, it is hoped that all ſcruples concerning the toleration of places of popiſh worſhip by government, out of Ambaſſador's houſes, or concerning protections from foreign miniſters of Britiſh prieſts or jeſuits, will now vaniſh away, and that our worthy Magiſtrates and honeſt Conſtables, both in town and country, will be alert, in proportion as the nature of the caſe endangers all that is dear to them and their proteſtant fellow-ſubjects. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

VIGILANTIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 3, 1765.

HAVING lately read, in ſome of the public papers, (which of them I do not particularly recollect) that "the Pope *allows*, and the Pretender "*protects*, a chapel in Rome, in which the ſervice "of the church of England is performed." I have taken ſome pains to be informed, what grounds there are for ſuch an aſſertion? It is hardly to be credited, that any proteſtant travellers, well affected to the Britiſh conſtitution in church and ſtate, would frequent a chapel under the *protection* of the popiſh Pretender to the Crown of Great Britain, even though the prayers for King George and the proteſtant Royal Family made a part of that ſervice, which it is equally abſurd to ſuppoſe, the Pope or the Pretender would either allow or permit. The truth of the matter is juſt this. There have always been about the Pretender's perſon a few *mongrel* proteſtants of the breed of old Leſley and Hickes, who have ſomething of a chapel allotted to them, where an Engliſh liturgy, *reformed* by the nonjurors in England about the time of the revolution, is uſed, and where a perſon ordained, as is ſaid, by old Deacon of Mancheſter, officiated not many years ago. The papiſts here, at home, have puffed this out, as a chapel tolerated by the Pope, and protected by the Chevalier, for the uſe of proteſtants in general who reſort to Rome; for

which they have been ſufficiently laughed at; the ſaid chapel being, indeed, an apartment in the Pretender's own houſe, and not more reſpectable either for its furniture, or capacity, than the hole where his Mock-Majeſty's ſcullion cleans his knives. And now it ſeems this is to be an argument for tolerating popiſh chapels in the metropolis of Great Britain! With reſpect to another aſſertion, which hath alſo appeared in our public prints, viz. that "other catholic Princes do wink at, or indirectly "tolerate the proteſtant worſhip in private houſes, "if not in chapels, in places of trade where fo-"reign merchants are ſettled, in which the mini-"ſters of their Courts do not reſide;" I am authoriſed to ſay, that though there are chaplains and meetings allowed for our factories in catholic countries; yet that the ſailors, or other proteſtants beſides the members of the factory, are not allowed to be preſent at thoſe meetings, particularly at Liſbon, where his Britannic Majeſty has a reſident miniſter. It hath been ſaid farther, that "no "jeſuit was convicted of conſpiracy againſt the "life of his preſent Portugueſe Majeſty, though "there were three or four accuſed of being con-"cerned in or privy to it, and that Malagrida "was executed for blaſphemy, hereſy, &c. in con-"ſequence of a ſentence of the inquiſition, and for "nothing relating to ſtate matters." Now if this is ſufficient to diſculpate the Portugueſe jeſuits, from treaſonable practices, we may argue thus in favour of the French jeſuits, expelled that kingdom by Henry the Fourth. "No jeſuit was convicted "of conſpiring with John Chaſtel (who ſtabbed "Henry the Fourth in the mouth) though ſeveral

"were

" were accuſed. And as for the jeſuit Guignard, " he ſuffered for writing a book upon a theological " ſubject, which other divines handled as well as " he." Yet the matter of fact is, that the Portugueſe jeſuits were as certainly expelled that kingdom, for being acceſſaries to the treaſon of the Tavoras, as the French jeſuits were for abetting John Chaſtel and Father Guignard; and as the Engliſh jeſuits deſerve to be for their known and avowed enmity to King George III. whom God preſerve from their treacherous machinations.

I am, SIR,

Yours, &c.

NO MASKER.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *Dec.* 14, 1765.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

AMONG other cauſes aſſigned for the late increaſe of popery, one has been the *non-reſidence* of the dignified and opulent clergy upon their reſpective cures, where their influence and learning might effectually prevent all attempts of popiſh emiſſaries upon the people committed to their charge. But in anſwer to this inſinuation, give me leave to obſerve, that theſe *non-reſidents*, as we have been told by a learned *eſtimator*, are to

be conſidered as *national preachers*[*], who, while they remain in any part of the iſland, are never out of their pariſh. But then, rejoin theſe objectors, why do not we hear them warning ſome part of their pariſh againſt popiſh inſolence and encroachment? Why, perhaps, becauſe they do not ſee matters of this ſort in the ſame light that you do. I remember one of theſe *national preachers* told us the laſt winter, that "Popiſh Biſhops go "about this pariſh of theirs, and perform every "part of their function, *without offence, and with-* "*out obſervation.*" And why ſhould any man *obſerve*, or *preach againſt* what gives him *no offence?* I muſt own, however, that this appearance is enough to puzzle a man who has not his wits about him; and others, who *do obſerve*, and *are offended*, by this practice of popiſh Biſhops, may plauſibly enough call this a *criminal ſupineneſs* in men to whom ſo lucrative emoluments are allotted, for the very purpoſe of defending the religion of their country againſt all ſecret and open invaders. But they who are converſant in the modern refinements of our theology know, that this is an old exploded idea, which hath been for ſome years ſuperſeded by a principle, the effect of which was firſt tried upon the Jew-bill, and is equally applicable to the caſe of popery. When the Jew-bill was in agitation, the doctrine of our *national preachers* was, that an attempt to incorporate the Jews into a chriſtian ſociety, tho' only by communicating to them a few *civil* privileges, was flying in the face of a *prophecy*, which either did, or was ſuppoſed to ſpeak of their continuance in a ſtate of *ſeparation*, till a certain period, which every one knew

[*] Dr. Browne's Eſtimate of the manners and principles, &c.

knew was not arrived. Conſiderations of chriſtian benevolence and humanity were in thoſe days weaker than a bull-ruſh, when oppoſed to this argumentation, and accordingly it was carried for a *prophecy*, expreſſed in obſcure and dubious terms, while the practical goſpel-duty was written, as it were with a ſun-beam. Now, as I am informed, Sir *Iſaac Newton*, in his comment on the book of the *Revelation*, hath found out, that popery muſt once more gain the aſcendant for a ſhort interval, all over *Europe*, and conſequently in the iſland of Britain. And if this be true, to oppoſe it, is once more flying in the face of a prophecy, and as plain a one at leaſt, as that which operated againſt the Jew-bill. Beſides, Sir *Iſaac* has mentioned no commencement of this interval, and as it is only to be a ſhort one, our *national preachers* will doubtleſs reaſon, that the ſooner it begins, the ſooner it will be over, and may think it no bad policy (as indeed ſome of the *unoffended* and *unobſerving* ſort are ſaid to deſire) to meet the papiſts half-way, in order that popery may incur its final doom the ſooner. I know theſe *national preachers* are called chriſtians, and I cannot but own it looks a little aukwardly for a chriſtian paſtor to connive at, and much more to permit his flock to be infected with ſo heinous a ſin as *idolatry*, or with the wicked, blood-thirſty principle of *not keeping faith with heretics*; and if there was any ſuch thing as getting over the prophecy, it would not be adviſeable. But I do not ſee how that is to be done, as every body knows Sir *Iſaac Newton* was a *demonſtrator*, as well as ſome of our *national preachers*. And therefore, all theſe things

being duly conſidered, I hope we ſhall no more hear tranſlations, commendams, non-reſidence or pluralities, reckoned among the cauſes of the progreſs of popery, and am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

RIDENTEM DICERE.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Dec.* 19, 1765.

SIR,

THE Writer of a letter in your Chronicle of Dec. 3, ſigned *No Maſker*, is pretty ſeverely taken to taſk (for ſomething he had ſaid concerning a nonjuring chapel at Rome) by a proteſtant Liſbon merchant in the *Public Ledger* of Dec. 7, who aſks your correſpondent the following queſtion: "Is "the ſervice of that chapel leſs heretical in the "opinion of the papiſts for being of the nonjuring "kind?" Now this merchant had been told, that the ſervice there uſed, is the liturgy of the church of England, reformed ſoon after the revolution; that is to ſay, reformed according to the ſyſtem of the nonjurors. What that ſyſtem is, the Gentleman might have learned from a pamphlet, entituled "A new Catechiſm, with Dr. Hickes's thirty nine "Articles." printed in 1710, which went through two if not three editions. Or he might have found a ſummary of this ſyſtem, publiſhed more lately, in Dr Middleton's Preface to his Remarks on

on two pamphlets written againſt his Introductory Diſcourſe, &c. 1748, where he would have ſeen, among other articles of the nonjuror's creed, a ſupreme and independent power aſcribed to the church—a propitiatory ſacrifice of Chriſt's body and blood for the living and dead—prayers for the dead to procure ſome relief and improvement of their intermediate ſtate, and as Dr. Middleton obſerves, almoſt every thing now practiſed or profeſſed by the Romaniſts, except abſolute tranſubſtantiation, and two more articles, concerning which the papiſts themſelves are not unanimous. Hence it may be eaſily determined, whether the nonjurors ſervice is not leſs heretical in the opinion of papiſts, than that of the church of England, as the latter ſtands at this day; or whether either the loyal ſubjects of the King, or the loyal ſons of our proteſtant church, would be ready to attend this chapel. It is true, the knowledge of theſe things does not lie in the way of merchants: But then ſhould not our Liſbon Merchant have ſpared the words impudence and ignorance? I could, if I would, proceed to other ſtrictures on other parts of the letter; but I conſider, Mr. Baldwin, how precious a little room in your paper is at this ſeaſon, which reminds me to forbear, at leaſt for the preſent. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

SIMPLICIUS PHILORCUS.

To the PRINTER.

Dec. 19, 1765

A late ADVENTURE.

AN artful popiſh prieſt, ſtationed in the ſeat-houſe of a Roman catholic family in Yorkſhire, had long caſt a wiſhful eye upon an honeſt ſimple miller in his neighbourhood, the father of four or five fine ſtrong lads, whom the prieſt conſidered as a valuable acquiſition to the cauſe, if the miller's converſion could be compaſſed. For which purpoſe, the miller was one day invited to ſee the curioſities in the chapel; when the father produced his whole cargo of crucifixes, madonas, and ſaints of all denominations; expatiating on the exquiſite workmanſhip, but more particularly on the power and miraculous influence of his graven and molten gods; concluding his homily with, "Well, "Joſeph, what do you think of theſe extraordi-"nary things? Are they not admirable?" The honeſt miller, ſcratching his head, and leering with great ſimplicity at the prieſt, replied in his country dialect: "Wya truly, Sur, they are o "varra pratty, but when o's dune, let God alean "for mackin a man." * The prieſt, confounded with this unexpected rebuff, diſmiſſed the poor miller

* *Why truly, Sir, they are all very pretty, but when all's done, let God alone for making a man.*

ſer in high wrath. And no wonder. Not Tillotſon, Stillingfleet, or Burnet, could have uttered a ſeverer ſarcaſm on his idolatrous trumpery than this ſimple ſentiment of untutored reaſon.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 24, 1765.

THE obligation you have laid upon me, by publiſhing my laſt letter, perhaps in the room of more marketable ware at hand, will require that I ſhould bring my proof from Archbiſhop Laud; that "the firſt clauſe of the twentieth article of religion, &c. is not injoined to be ſubſcribed by act of parliament," into as ſhort a compaſs as I can. Thus then the ſaid Archbiſhop expreſſed himſelf in his ſpeech in the ſtar-chamber, 1637. "If you look back and conſider who they were that governed buſineſſes in 1571, and rid the church, almoſt at their pleaſure, and how potent the anceſtors of theſe libellers, (Prynn, Burton, and Baſtwick) began then to grow, you will think it no hard matter to have the articles printed, and this clauſe left out." Now this 1571, was the very 13th of Elizabeth, when ſubſcription was firſt enjoined by parliament, and by whoſe means ſoever it happened or was procured, if the clauſe was left out of that copy of the articles refered to in that act (as Laud's account of the matter clearly allows) they who ſubſcribe by virtue of that act, as all ſubſcribers do, and have

done from the day it took place, to this preſent 6th of October, 1765, have not ſubſcribed that clauſe *de Jure*, but as a mere impoſition of thoſe who added that clauſe, not only without any authority of parliament, but in direct contradiction to the very genius and ſpirit of our happy conſtitution, which allows the church, as ſuch, no authority of that kind, and which looks upon that clauſe as a mere popiſh principle, and as ſuch condemns it. The foregoing inſtance, and others of a later date, plainly ſhew that the venerable aſſembly of our repreſentatives in former times, have not thought the thirty-nine articles below their notice, and may we not hope, that in a point which concerns the conſtitutional juriſdiction of parliament ſo nearly, they will take this ſyſtem of doctrine once more into conſideration, and reduce the church to her proper bounds? Perhaps we may be told, that the miniſtry will be cautious of irritating the clergy at this juncture, as the latter may be of ſo much ſervice to the infancy of their power. Are the clergy then, an irritable generation in ſuch caſes? They are not their friends who inſinuate any ſuch thing. Be that as it may, it is an objection which, I think, would more nearly have affected the late miniſtry, who might want the aſſiſtance of a time-ſerving clergy, to bring about certain meaſures, to which their politics ſeemed to lead them—Politics congenial with thoſe of the Laudæan clergy, the race of whom, whatever the public may think, is very far from being extinct. But a righteous and public-ſpirited adminiſtration can have no occaſion for a time-ſerving clergy, or for the clergy in any capacity, but that of faithful and

and conſcientious paſtors of their reſpective flocks; of able and diligent watchmen, as well for the future ſalvation of the people as for their preſent welfare, and as fellow ſubjects with them under a free government. Perhaps, in time, the encroachments of the clergy may come to be real grievances to the people. Their power and opulence at leaſt, are in a progreſſive ſtate; and increaſing power and opulence, in any hands, have a natural tendency to tyranny and oppreſſion. It is to be hoped therefore, that a true whig miniſtry will have ſome ſolicitude to bring our eccleſiaſtical ſyſtem under ſome regulation, to prevent the conſequences of the clergy's growing too great to be reformed, when perhaps their ſucceſſors, and our poſterity, may have the will to humble them without the power. There is one conſideration, which, in my poor opinion, requires the immediate abolition of the obnoxious clauſe above-mentioned; and that is, the viſible and highly ſcandalous, as well as alarming, increaſe of popery. Grant the church of Rome the power of decreeing rites and ceremonies, and authority in controverſies of faith, and you put weapons into their hands, againſt which no ſcriptural armour will be proof. And how can you but grant it, when the papiſts are able to ſhew you the ſame doctrine, even in your own proteſtant articles! I have heard it ſaid, that this very circumſtance accounts for the little, the very little, we hear of the clergy's oppoſition to the preſent ſpread of this vile ſuperſtition. If the church of Rome has really this power, it is in vain to attack her upon the article of even her idolatrous rites and ceremonies. If the church of Rome has it not,

how

how comes the church of England by it? A queſtion, which as appears by ſome certain tokens, our great churchmen deſire to have publicly diſcuſſed.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 26, 1765.

THE juſtly celebrated and matchleſs Dr. Middleton, in the dedication of his letter from Rome to Dr. Gooch, then Biſhop of Norwich, has the following paſſage—"But while I was—fancy-"ing myſelf engaged in a laudable attempt of diſ-"arming theſe profeſſed enemies of our religion and "liberty, [the papiſts] there were ſome, as your "Lordſhip knows, even of our own church, whoſe "diſpleaſure I incurred, and whoſe reſentment I "have felt on account of this very work." This open appeal to a Biſhop, puts the truth of the fact here mentioned out of all diſpute. But how ſhall we account for it? We are here left quite in the dark. If we were in poſſeſſion of the motives of this diſpleaſure of our churchmen incurred by Dr. Middleton, it would be of great uſe in diſcovering what encouragement one might expect in attacking popery at this critical juncture. Did Dr. Middleton feel the reſentment of great churchmen (for that of little ones he would not have regarded) from

from any apprehenſion that the demolition of popery might affect their own ſyſtem? This I think could hardly be. Did they then apprehend that the conſequences to be drawn from Dr. Middleton's particular premiſſes, were unfriendly to ſome parts of the eſtabliſhed inſtitutions of the church of England? Sorry ſhould I be to ſuppoſe, even for a moment, that this was the caſe; as on the one hand, the opponents of popery muſt either incur the diſpleaſure of their fathers and brethren; or, on the other, deſert the defence of one of their ſtrongeſt forts. I ſhould be glad, Mr. Baldwin, to ſee this matter explained by ſome of your very able correſpondents, the rather as I find a notion is got abroad that our leading churchmen are not very ſanguine in this warfare with the papiſts, and that all this ſtir is occaſioned by the forwardneſs of a few poor curates, who have nothing to do but to mind their clerical calling, and nothing to hope for but a better birth in another world, than they have reaſon to look for here. I recollect indeed a great divine* who attacked Dr. Middleton's Derivation of Popiſh Idolatry from that of Paganiſm; which, however, the Doctor ſtrenuouſly defended. His learned adverſary declined a formal rejoinder, not, as he aſſured us, for want of arms or abilities, but out of a friendly diſpoſition to the reputation of his antagoniſt; which I think was droll enough, after he had told the world that his argument was not worth a ſtraw. However, I ſhould think proteſtants of the church of England have a right to know from their teachers, from what Romiſh idolatory is derived, if not from paganiſm; eſpecially as the learned divine above-

men-

* Biſhop Warburton.

mentioned, hath left us no alternative of the origin of popiſh idolatry, but the primitive ſimplicity of the antient church of Rome. In one word, Mr. Baldwin, we live in the days of myſtery, with reſpect to affairs both in church and ſtate. We are told with great formality that they have entered into a ſtrict alliance, which, by the yearly increaſing bulk of the record, ſhould ſeem to have a number of ſecret and ſeparate articles, relative to ſome object which is kept out of ſight. I remember, in the days of our ſimplicity, when ſuch an alliance was talked of, under the leſs ſcientific idea of the conſtitution of Great Britain, the grand object of it was to keep out popery and arbitrary power, which the church on one ſide, and the ſtate on the other, watched over, and occaſionally ſkirmiſhed with every day. For my part, I am inclined to think, our civil and eccleſiaſtical policy might begin to vary about the time Dr. Middleton made his complaint, and that the new Alliance might then be in projection. But this is only my crude conjecture, and I wait with impatience for ſomething more ſatisfactory from your correſpondents. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

SPECULATOR.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Dec.* 26, 1765.

AS the caſe of parliamentary boroughs ſeem to employ ſome part of the public attention, I hope you will, at ſome convenient time, find a little room for the following obſervations on that very intereſting ſubject. I take it for granted that if all the boroughs in England which ſend members to parliament, were ſtill to elect their repreſentatives according to the *original mode*, ſettled when they firſt became intituled to that privilege, not one in ten of them could be engroſſed by any opulent commoner, or titled nobleman, without abſolutely reducing the borough itſelf to a ſtate of depopulation. But the members of corporation towns, and the borough-holders, having by length of time, and corruption and careleſſneſs of different kinds, become ignorant of their original rights, it became an eaſy matter for Recorders, Town-clerks, and other wickedly artful men, to preſcribe new modes of election, and to exclude all from giving their votes, who were not qualified with a ſufficient ſtock of partiality towards the party engaged, to pay the public officers, or private agents, who undertook the management of the election. The caſe of the Ayleſbury men, and that of Bewdley, in 1708, are inſtances how feaſible ſuch attempts have been, and one might bring twenty more, where ſuch attempts have had better ſucceſs.

Hence

Hence it appears, that the leading officers of boroughs and corporation towns, (who generally either are themſelves, or have connections with half-bred lawyers, under the name of Recorders, or pettifogging attorneys, in quality of Town-clerks) having opportunity of ſecreting ancient records, and of miſrepreſenting by paſt tranſactions, have found it an eaſy matter to obtain a *reſolution*, eſtabliſhing a new model of election for all time to come, which *reſolution*, being afterwards confirmed by the act to prevent bribery at elections, has barred up all acceſs to ancient privileges, in a number of inſtances, where ſuch privileges would, even yet, be otherwiſe recoverable. I remember a caſe about thirty years ago, where the returning officer of the borough, having returned two members upon a majority of freemen's votes upon the poll, in preference to two candidates ſupported by owners of borough houſes, the latter petitioned, and the Town-clerk and Recorder being gained by the petitioners, the returned members were ouſted without much difficulty. It happened, however, that the ſaid Town-clerk being obliged occaſionally, and pending the conteſt, to exhibit to an eminent Serjeant of thoſe days (retained as counſel for the burgage tenure) a truer ſtate of the caſe than his brief ſet forth, the conſequence was, that the Town-clerk propoſing to bring an action againſt the returning officer for ſomething that paſſed at the time of election, was told by the ſaid Serjeant, that the Mayor had done nothing but his duty, having ſtrictly followed the directions of the charter, as well as ſome precedents, which it was more in the Town-clerk's power to ſecrete. The Serjeant's

jeant's opinion I have ſeen under his own hand, as well as the muniments on which it was grounded. I forbear to give the more modern hiſtory of the borough, becauſe it is not ſingular. But if ever that happy day ſhould come when the great council of the nation ſhould be diſpoſed to relieve hardſhips of this nature, this caſe will be ready for their information, with ſuch vouchers as will leave no room for a demurr. It may be ſaid, if people will ſuffer themſelves to be enſlaved, who can help it? and what buſineſs is it of ours, who have no intereſt or concern in ſuch boroughs? Suppoſe this to be the caſe, they are your brethren and fellow ſubjects of the ſame government, and if their forefathers were guilty, their ſuffering poſterity are innocent: But in truth the caſe is yours as much as theirs; and the repreſentative of the rotteneſt borough in England, has as good a vote in the cauſe where you are moſt of all intereſted, as the man whom your free voice ſends to repreſent you. Be it remembered then by all ranks of electors, that it is their intereſt, and the intereſt of the public that ſome remedy ſhould be found for this great, and, as yet, increaſing evil. In no long time there will be no room for it to increaſe. And if you cannot do all you would to relieve it, determine at leaſt to do all you can. If it cannot be procured to ſubſtitute modes of election of a more conſtitutional complexion than thoſe at preſent in uſe within borough towns; prevail, if you can, to have the clauſe in the act, under which the rogueries of mercenary pettifoggers take refuge, repealed, that gentlemen of your own chooſing may have at leaſt a chance to make good their return upon the original principles

of

of election; I will be bold to say, that the repeal of that single clause would be a more valuable accession to the liberty of the British subject, than the repeal of twenty cyder acts.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A Free Burgess in Fetters.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *Dec.* 26, 1765.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

WHILE I was in vain searching after the letters which passed between the foreign ministers and his late Majesty's Secretaries of State in 1745, mentioned in one of your advertisements, I found them very opportunely published in your Chronicle. I doubt not but some of those who openly abet, or with a shew of *moderation* would *screen* the cause of popery, may ask how the case there stated applies to the present times? which I think may be easily answered. It is true, there is now no *open* rebellion in the kingdom in favour of a popish Pretender; but are there no symptoms of a lurking distemper of that kind, ready to break out upon the first occasion? For is it not true that popish priests swarm more than ever in this city? Is it not true that they are irreconcileable enemies to his Majesty's government? Is it not true they utter *injurious discourses*

curſes and even *threats?* Do they not, even in the public prints, put us in mind of Sir *Edmundbury Godfrey*, *Daggers*, &c. as in a morning paper, of Dec. 6 and 7? Is it not true that theſe popiſh prieſts and their emiſſaries make daily converſions of his Majeſty's proteſtant ſubjects to the Roman catholic faith? Is it not true that open chapels are maintained under colour of public protection, with an *enormous* number of prieſts, out of the houſes of foreign miniſters? Is it not true that maſs is celebrated in theſe chapels from morning to night? Is it not true that theſe chapels are rather for the ſake of furniſhing his Majeſty's *converted* ſubjects with opportunities of being preſent at maſs againſt law, than for——any other purpoſe? And can there be ſurer indications of the ſecret *plottings* of theſe popiſh prieſts againſt the King's government? His Excellency the *then* Secretary of State aſks,—"Is there any Roman catholic country "where ſuch an extenſion of their privileges is al-"lowed to proteſtant miniſters? Is there any ſuch "thing practiſed at *Vienna*, *Paris*, or at *Madrid?*" Would his Excellency have put ſuch queſtions as theſe, without being certain they could not be anſwered in the affirmative? But here a *Proteſtant Liſbon Merchant* ſteps in, and in a morning paper for *December* 7, informs us of the liberty proteſtants have at *Liſbon* of going as publicly to our Envoy's chapel, as people in *London* go to St. *Paul's*. I make no doubt but this Gentleman is what he pretends to be, *a proteſtant*. He ſeems to be a man of ſenſe, and I ſhould have paid more reſpect to his letter, but for ſome *choleric* expreſſions in the beginning of it that ſavour not of that *politeneſs*, which,

which, by his own confeſſion, he might have learned in *Portugal*. I do not love *raſhneſs* or *miſrepreſentation*, even in defence of the beſt cauſe in the world; but miſtakes which are *not malicious* ſhould be more gently corrected. For my part, I cannot think his repreſentation of the caſe at *Liſbon*, comes up to the *extenſion* mentioned in the Secretary of State's letter, nor indeed to a *full confutation* of the perſon, with whom he thinks he hath ſo much reaſon to be out of temper. In the firſt place, there is, I ſuppoſe, but *one* chapel kept open at *Liſbon*, and that without *back-doors* to it, or ſecret avenues to accommodate his *Portugueſe* Majeſty's *proteſtant* ſubjects, if any ſuch there are: Add to this, that the Engliſh proteſtants at *Liſbon* are not ſo *ligetted* to their worſhip as the papiſts are at *London*. For, according to this Gentleman, they admit of an *intercommunity* of religious ceremonies with the *Portugueſe* papiſts, to a degree of *politeneſs*, which ſome proteſtants at home, do not think extremely edifying. With reſpect to our ſailors, it is allowed by this Gentleman, that they *do not go often* to the Envoy's chapel, and I will for the preſent give him credit for the truth of the reaſons he aſſigns. I will only remind him of the point from which the debate wherein he hath taken a part, firſt began, *viz.* whether from the diſtant ſituation of foreign ſhipping in the river, it is not *inconvenient* for foreign Roman catholic ſailors to attend the chapels of foreign Embaſſadors? Is there no ſuch *inconvenience* with reſpect to the ſituation of the Engliſh ſhipping in the *Tagus?* Or does the Portugueſe government allow or connive at one or more proteſtant chapels under the protection of his Bri-

Britannic Majeſty's Envoy, more commodiouſly ſituated for the the attendance of Britiſh ſailors? If not, and if the *inconveniences* are ſimilar in both caſes, the plea for tolerating popiſh chapels out of miniſters houſes, for the accommodation of foreign ſailors, falls to the ground. Let us ſhew as much lenity and forbearance as poſſible to all religious opinions *properly* ſuch. But popery is not of this innocent complexion. It is, under the maſk of religion, the genuine engine of tyranny and arbitrary power. Let us not then be duped by its artifices, bullied by its menaces, or ſneered by its impudent buffoonery, out of every thing dear to Britiſh proteſtants under the free government of the illuſtrious Houſe of *Hanover*. I am,

SIR, *&c.*

A LONDON CURATE.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Jan.* 1, 1766.

An affectionate Addreſs to Britiſh Proteſtant Diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed Church of England, of all Denominations.

BRETHREN, FRIENDS, COUNTRYMEN, FELLOW-CHRISTIANS.

A Cry that popery is once more rearing her horrible head in this land of liberty, is gone forth, and hath been ſeconded by proofs which will admit of no diſpute. The papiſts and their abet-

abettors, avow the fact, plead for it, and even inſult us with their ſucceſs in the pubile prints, as appears by a ſet of audacious queries publiſhed in one of them of December 14. Whence is it that your paſtors and leaders are ſo ſilent on this intereſting occaſion? Is it out of all memory what your worthy forefathers have ſuffered from the iron claws of intolerance? Are all records loſt of the noble and undaunted teſtimony they bore againſt religious and civil oppreſſion under every diſadvantage, danger, and indignity, that could intimidate the human ſpirit? And are the comparative eaſe and advantages you now enjoy indifferent to you? But I am checked in the midſt of my expoſtulations, and hear you rejoin: "Why all this "to us? Have we the leading religious intereſt "of the kingdom in our hands? Why do you not "apply to your own great churchmen, who ſhould "naturally take the fore front in this warfare? "Are not we, notwithſtanding the toleration law, "the objects of ſcandal and contempt with every "orthodox ſon of the church? And if you be "afraid for the members of your own flock, can "you believe that our productions would make "half ſo much impreſſion upon them, as thoſe of "the common enemy? permit us then to content "ourſelves with admoniſhing our own people in "our tolerated department, and rouſe your own "ſlumbering watchmen to lead us the way at leaſt, "if we are to engage in public operations." Patience, my beloved brethren! bear, with a man, who, though a ſon of the eſtabliſhed church, deſires not to ſet himſelf above the level of the meaneſt among you, and whoſe complaints upon this

this or any other topic of reformation, would be heard by our great churchmen, with as little regard as yours. It is the cauſe of the proteſtant, and even of the chriſtian religion, and not any paltry excluſive intereſt, for which your aid is ſolicited. There are men, nay, I will be bold to ſay, miniſters in our church, who value their temporal emoluments as little, and their bibles and chriſtian liberty, as much as any of you. Think not that you lie under any reproachful imputation with theſe, and I truſt there are thouſands of them in the land. Preſbyterian, Independent, Anabaptiſt, are no longer terms of reproach with us, except when we ſee here and there a man of theſe denominations, wrought upon by baſe lucrative views, and time-ſerving motives, *forſaking his firſt love*, and attaching himſelf to a church or a miniſtry for the loaves and fiſhes. Such a one, into whatever height of power, or dignity of office he may wriggle himſelf by his zig-zag principles and motions, is juſt as contemptible in our eyes, as in yours. Eſteem and reproach (thank God for better times) have long ſince ceaſed to be joined to names and profeſſions, and are now, as they ought to be, transferred to actions and principles. Even the name of Quaker is no longer a name of ſcorn, but the popular appellation of a reſpectable ſet of chriſtians, whoſe benevolent, innocent, and edifying principles every one muſt admire, who hath peruſed thoſe excellent rules of diſcipline (ſet forth by Dr. Rutty) by which the affairs of that laudable ſociety are conducted. You ſee then, worthy brethren, you may now interpoſe your endeavours againſt the common enemy, with more advantage than you

are aware of, and there is one conſideration which makes me with for your aſſiſtance on this occaſion with more than common earneſtneſs. It is this. You can puſh popery to the utmoſt extremity, without the leaſt apprehenſion of recrimination. It is underſtood, that, with reſpect to forms, all amongſt you is plain and ſimple, pure and evangelical, undefiled and unadulterated with any dregs of ſuperſtition, reſting only on the ſolid baſis of the goſpel. With what ſuperior force might you attack this mother of harlots and abominations, and ſhew, by exemplifying the ſimplicity of primitive times, the ſufficiency of ſcripture for all the purpoſes of ſalvation? It is not to be diſſembled that our church hath not this full advantage. The papiſts themſelves remind us of too many particulars, which they tell us are ſtriking reſemblances, if not exact copies of their originals. Theſe you can effectually diſclaim, and may leave us to defend them as we can, which, to ſay the truth, is not, in ſome caſes, eaſily to be done. The time was when your pious and learned forefathers held up a mirror to the eſtabliſhed church of England: A magnifying mirror, perhaps, in ſome reſpects; but, in others, a faithful mirror, truly repreſenting ſpots and wrinkles, which though we did not willingly contemplate, put us upon our guard, and made us careful to keep them out of ſight, and prevent them from overſpreading the face of our venerable and reſpected mother. Of late we have not often heard from you on this ſubject; hardly ever but when ſome raſh headſtrong churchman hath called forth your champions with no credit to himſelf in the event. Some of us even with you had re-

repeated theſe admonitions, at ſhorter intervals, with decency and temper; and I much queſtion whether your ſilence, and our repoſe in conſequence of it, have been edifying to either party. Is not the late increaſe of popery, one proof at leaſt that they have not? An epiſcopal hierarchy upon any plan, will bear watching. Spiritual power is extremely intoxicating even in thoſe heads which laid in their firſt religious erudition with very low notions of it. There are members among ourſelves, who ſee with concern, where things are not right, and where they are going ſtill farther wrong. But to every ſuggeſtion in favour of reformation from us, a ſhort reproof is ever ready, viz. *affront not the eſtabliſhment that maintains you.* I need not tell you what may be made of this among the mob. You are out of the reach of ſuch impertinent unmanly reprehenſion. Be prevailed with then, worthy fellow-proteſtants, to exert yourſelves on this important occaſion; and fear not that you will be left to maintain the conflict alone. If our principals ſhould be ſlack and backward in the ſervice, there are others in inferior ſtations equally able, who will join you with alacrity, without apprehending that the church of England can be eſſentially hurt through the ſides of popery. The great, the renowned Chillingworth was of the church of England, and numbers of us are ready to eſpouſe and aſſert his principle, that "the BIBLE only is the "religion of proteſtants," without being anxious for the fate of human inventions. And let none of us, thus united, ſuffer ourſelves to be amuſed and enſnared with outward ſhews of civility, and the mildmed cant of moderation which amount to no-

thing, and mean nothing, but to ſupply the place of opiates, that when we are ſufficiently doſed, the lurking aſſaſſin may execute his murderous purpoſe with the greater ſecurity. I am,

Highly eſteemed fellow-proteſtants,

Your ſincerely affectionate brother,

A COUNTRY CURATE

Jan. 1, 1766. *Of the Eſtabliſhed Church*

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 21, 1766.

TO trace the progreſs of toryiſm in church and ſtate from the year 1746 to the preſent times, would require a volume of no ſmall ſize. I mean to trace it through thoſe ſucceſſive publications wherein it hath appeared ſometimes with open front, and ſometimes half maſked, down from certain complete hiſtories, reviews, &c. to Brooke's defence of the Iriſh papiſts, and Phillips's life of Cardinal Pole. For the more ſecret combinations of thoſe under whoſe patronage and encouragement it hath attained to its preſent near approach to maturity, muſt be left for the detection of poſterity, if any patriotic hand ſhould ſurvive the preſent perilous criſis to which toryiſm hath reduced us, ſufficiently inſtructed, and ſufficiently hardy to expoſe the darkſome machinations of the Junto, with the Caledonian Chief at their head, which time and accidents will perhaps gradually uncover. There is good reaſon to believe, that beſides the lighter and

more

more popular performances in favour of toryiſm, calculated to take in the million, grave and ſolemn writers have been taſked to promote the cauſe, by way of theory and demonſtration. Among others of this ſtamp, the late Biſhop Ellys is noticed for one in your Chronicle, who ſeems in ſome paſſages of his treatiſes to have been deſirous to carry us back a good round trot towards another ſchiſm bill; I well remember to have heard, about the time when this divine was dignified with the mitre, that a leading, and at the ſame time a led churchman being aſked, Why he would lend his hand to the promotion of a man of known tory principles; replied, *The ſtick has been bent too much the other way*. If any one wants a comment upon theſe words, he may find a very learned one in the dedication to the ſecond volume of a noted work, publiſhed in 1738, where the writer tells his patron, that the friends of the acceſſion which happened in the year 1714, "had, in taking up the pen againſt the jacobite clergy, gone much too far.*" How, I beſeech you? "Why, by confuting and decrying the "uſurpations of a popiſh hierarchy, they virtually "deprived the church of every power and privilege "which, as a ſimple ſociety, ſhe might claim." But who could poſſibly help this, if it appeared by the moſt legitimate concluſions, drawn from the cleareſt and moſt evident premiſſes, that this ſame *ſimple ſociety* claimed every power and privilege, and under the ſame title that popiſh hierarchy had ever done? And why the popiſh hierarchy? Were

* See the dedication of the Divine Legation of Moſes, &c. to Lord Mansfield, 1758.

the adverſaries of Biſhop Hoadley prieſts of the Romiſh church? Were Potter, Snape, Sherlock, Atterbury, Hare, and Nicholſon, members of the popiſh hierarchy? Were all of them jacobite clergymen? In the mean time be it remarked, that this our cool moderator diſdains not to uſe one of the ſtale arts of the popiſh controvertiſts, againſt theſe friends of the [Hanover] acceſſion, by repreſenting them as receiving aſſiſtance from, if not in connexion with infidels, and enemies of revelation; the conſtant cant of all papal polemics, as often as they are pinched by the proteſtants on the article of church uſurpations. Well then, theſe champions of this *ſimple ſociety* have got the church once more reinſtated in her claim of ancient powers and privileges. And what has been the conſequence? While theſe friends of the acceſſion were countenanced and encouraged, little was heard of popiſh or jacobitical inſolence. It was confined to holes and corners, and left to curſe the ſucceſs of the proteſtant cauſe in the depths of obſcurity. Papiſts and nonjurors in thoſe days very ſeldom ſhewed their ignominious heads in poiſonous reſcripts from the preſs, or in other attempts to debauch the loyal ſubjects of Great Britain. But ſince Alliances, treatiſes on ſpiritual and eſſays upon civil liberty came into faſhion, popery and arbitrary principles of government have been releaſed from their reſtraint. Papiſts ſet up to be the beſt ſubjects of a proteſtant government upon the merit of their implicit ſubmiſſion to the uſurpations of the popiſh hierarchy. In one of the late popiſh pamphlets the church of Rome is ready to ſhake hands with the church of England, and even to claim kindred with her

her by reckoning up the degrees of affinity between them. Whilſt on the other hand, a partizan of the eſtabliſhed church, not to be behind the other in mutual civility, exults over a proteſtant diſſenter in the contemplation that, "popiſh Biſhops go about, "and exercise every part of their function without "offence, and without obſervation;" and does ſo much honour to the fact, as to make it a precedent for the ſubmiſſion of the Americans to prelatical church government, which puts me in mind of a writer in your Chronicle, Mr. Baldwin, under the name of *Il Moderato*, who makes much the ſame uſe of the circumſtance, that the late Pope of Rome was a very fine Gentleman. It is true the late Pope was a fine Gentleman; and ſo was a late Archbiſhop of Canterbury. But is that a reaſon why the proteſtants of Great Britain ſhould come under the ſpiritual dominion of the preſent Pope? And does he ſuppoſe the Americans have not ſenſe enough to aſk him the ſame queſtion, *mutatis mutandis?* I am, SIR,

Your conſtant reader,

An unchangeable Whig.

ST JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Jan.* 28, 1766.

A FRAGMENT.

* * * * AT laſt went about it. Shakeſpeare ſeems to be the rock on which the leading geniuſes of the preſent age are deſtined to ſplit. Critics of

all ſizes and complexions *take a pride to gird at Shakeſpeare*. He is the butt of the critics, as Falſtaff was of the jokers. But as Falſtaff, though ſometimes *put down* by Hal and Poins, was always an over-match for ancient Piſtol, ſo Shakeſpeare's modern critics, whoſe ſtyle and manner is totally *piſtolian*, ſeldom return from their conflicts with the old bard, without ſhame and loſs. One abſurdity is common to them all; namely, that whereas they proclaim Shakeſpeare *the poet of nature*, they moſt commonly attempt, where the expreſſion is obſcure, ambiguous, or apparently corrupt, to fix his meaning by the rules of ſome *artificial* theory. This is notoriouſly the caſe with Upton, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnſon, and a certain *periodical* critic, who hath taken Dr. Johnſon to taſk in a monthly pamphlet for November 1765; and who, moſt inconſiſtently reproaches Theobald for *groveling*, at the ſame time that he is recommending to fix Shakeſpeare's ſenſe, where it is doubtful, by the vulgar idioms of Yorkſhire and Scotland. It is, indeed, highly entertaining to ſee theſe two old friends, heretofore engaged (and, as ſome people pretend, penſioned) in the ſame political cauſe, committed together in a literary one, not without ſome little regret on the part of the aſſailant, ſome little ſtruggle between a predilection for his own critical talents, and a ſolicitude to manage the reputation of ſo uſeful a partizan as the definer of *abdication*. That Dr. Johnſon, in his late undertaking, hath diſappointed the expectations of the public, is highly probable. But that the *periodical critic* is the man to ſupply his defects, will hardly be granted by thoſe who have obſerved him

to

to infift, that " Dr. Warburton underftood Shake-
" fpeare better than all his editors put together,-
" that Sir T. Hanmer enriched himfelf with Dr.
" Warburton's fpoils,—and that the late Mr. Ed-
" wards had not any great knowledge of his au-
" thor." Had the *canons of criticifm* laid as lumber in Bookfellers warehoufes, or had *the poor penitent thief** ftill fuppreffed the *caftrations* of Sir T. Hanmer's letter to Dr. Smith, this might have paffed with the weak and the credulous. But thefe documents being now in the hands of the public, a judgment fo contrary to the dictates of common fenfe, as well as matter of fact, cannot be aferibed to any thing elfe (for doubtlefs the *periodical critic* does not want difcernment when he chafes to employ it) than the obfufcations of *political prejudice*. The truth is, the ingenious and amiable Mr. Edwards was a whig of the revolution ftamp. *That* alone was fufficient to juftify Dr J. to himfelf for undervaluing the *canonift* in his preface, and profiting by him in the progrefs of his work without the leaft acknowledgment. I would not fay that the *periodical* writer hath the fame quarrel with him, if I had ever known the faid writer to have once done juftice to the literary

 merit

* One *Philip Nichols*, formerly of Trinity Hall in Cambridge, who, upon an accufation of pilfering books, *left* the univerfity, and, having acquired an intereft in the *Biographia Britannica*, turned evidence againft fome of his brother pilferers, called *caftrators*; and entertained the public with fome of their pranks in a quarto pamphlet intituled, *The collated Letter of Sir* Thomas Hanmer *in the fixth volume of* Biographia Britannica, *wherein is difcovered the juft rife of the preſent Bp. of* Glouceſter's *quarrel with that Baronet about his edition of Shakeſpeare's Plays*, &c. &c.

merit of any one man of Mr. Edwards's political principles that ever came in his way. Poor Theobald ſuffers on the ſame ſcore, and, to ſay the truth, has ſuffered by others, beſides theſe two, as appears by certain anecdotes concerning the *alliances* of the Dunciad, of which the public will, probably, one of theſe days be in poſſeſſion. But to proceed with theſe ſatellites of Shakeſpeare. Of the three congenial critics, the Doctors W. and J. and the *periodical* writer, the acrimony of the ſecond is, by far, the moſt under government. The moſt obvious, and the moſt deſerving object of his critical ſpleen, was his immediate predeceſſor in the province of an editor of Shakeſpeare. Yet this rival he treats with much civility, apologizing for the ſtrictures he makes upon him, paying him compliments, taking him occaſionally under his wing, and even adopting ſome of his viſionary notes and corrections, to the manifeſt detriment of his own edition. Dr. Johnſon probably foreſaw (what has ſince been revealed to the public) that a critic advanced in years, and of an indolent diſpoſition, *might not, at the long run, have reaſon to applaud his ſituation*, ſhould he venture to *injure* this formidable Coloſſus in literature; and what was meant by the word *injure* in the preſent caſe, the veteran might learn from *the delicacy of friendſhip*, with much more certainty and preciſion than from his own dictionary. The *periodical* Ariſtarchus hath not an equal degree of complaiſance for Dr. Johnſon, whoſe known *nonchalance* eaſed him of all apprehenſions of repriſals from that quarter. But he could not ſo well depend upon the tameneſs of the other without a little ſtroaking, which he accord-

cordingly practiſes, not by covering the nakedneſs of the ſaid Coloſſus, (for that he had ſenſe enough to ſee was impracticable) but by abuſing the man who had *uncovered* it. At length a little tenderneſs for his old comrade in the *Batcan* warfare recurring, he contrives to put both theſe worſhipful editors into the ſame half-compliment; intimating that as Newton's Principia, and Napier's Logarithms, ſuffered nothing in the eſtimation of the learned, from the circumſtance that their reſpective authors had written upon the Apocalypſe; ſo neither would the Divine Legation, nor a certain Dictionary be the leſs eſteemed, or fare the worſe for two miſerable editions of Shakeſpeare by the ſame hands. But this, to make free with an expreſſion of one of theſe editors, is *a complication of miſtakes*. Sir I. Newton's book on the Revelation is in better eſteem than this critic thinks of. On the other hand, had Dr. W—b—t—n kept his fingers off Shakeſpeare's hallowed page, his nakedneſs in the D. L. might have remained under its fig-leaves to this good hour. But when his licentious treatment of an author, in the hands of every polite ſcholar, came to be ſeen, and afterwards to be expoſed, by Edwards, to the diverſion even of ſchool boys and women, it began to be more than ſuſpected that he might have taken liberties with the ſacred writings upon equally ſlender grounds. This, upon examination, was found to be actually the caſe; till at length, after gradual detections of one reverie after another, a learned profeſſor found it equally neceſſary, and equally eaſy to do the ſame ſervice for Job, that Mr. Edwards had done for Shakeſpeare. Dr. Johnſon

ſeems

ſeems to be upon the brink of the ſame precipice. Whiſpers have gone abroad, that he was not the propereſt perſon in the world to compile a dictionary of the Engliſh language; and he will have great good luck, if what has been hitherto ſpoken of in ſecret, his edition of Shakeſpeare does not proclaim aloud: On another hand, the *periodical critic* is very likely to be mortified by hearing from the firſt rate judges in the republic of letters, that Theobald's edition of Shakeſpeare of 1740, is the moſt correct, and conſequently the moſt valuable of any *yet* extent. This *periodical writer*, however, will always find the means of making himſelf amends for all his diſgraces, ſufferings, and ſelf-denials, as long as a certain monthly production is ſaleable. If for reaſons of ſtate he is obliged to ſpare Dr. Johnſon, and the other editor for reaſons of church, he takes occaſion to relieve his conſtraint in the tail of the ſame pamphlet, by letting himſelf looſe with all glee and wantonneſs upon ſome innocent encomiums, proſaic and poetical on the ever to be lamented Duke of CUMBERLAND. But not to dwell on circumſtances which do hon******.——*The reſt is torn off.*

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Jan.* 30, 1766.

SO, Mr. Baldwin! we are got paled up in a park it ſeems, like ſo many horned ſtags. *Horned* ſtags! Think of that, Mr. Baldwin. Horniſied, perhaps, by the park-keepers themſelves: For

For theſe park-keepers, let me tell you, are dear lovers of veniſon, and of doe-veniſon particularly. So that between male and female veniſon, and a little claret among hands, the elders are ſometimes laid up in the gout, and obliged to delegate the province of the quarter ſtaff to the juniors in training. By the by, this metaphor of a park and deer, is not incongruous. The pretence of the park-keepers is to carry us to heaven, towards which, hornification, if taken patiently, hath, according to the old proverb, a wonderful effect. This *Il Moderato* ſhould ſeem, by his name, to be an Italian park-keeper, a retainer I ſuppoſe, to a certain very fine old gentleman at Rome, with a deputation in his pocket, to keep the parks *alterius Orbis*, of this other world, including America. Did I not tell you, Mr. Baldwin, we ſhould preſently have the true picture of an American Prelate? I did not expect, however, that the Gentleman would be ſo indiſcreet, as to draw it himſelf. Well, let who will truſt himſelf and hi doe with ſuch park-keepers, I am reſolved to keep on the outſide of the pales, and to browze, as well as I can, upon the common; and if I am deſtined to have horns, they ſhall not be of Mr. Moderato's planting, for I like none of his breed. Commend me, however, to the man who ſpeaks out, and tells us at once what we are to expect, viz. that we are not to take a walk in the park, even though we go in at the wicket that is opened on purpoſe for us, on the pain of being treated as rogues and deer-ſtealers. There is brother Cato too, in the ſame paper; another Roman park-keeper forſooth! who is rather in more haſte than the

the gentle Moderato. He is all in a hurry for a reſtoration, and will not allow, that he who does not wear a ſlip of oak on the twenty-ninth of May, either deſires or deſerves to —— wear a white roſe on the tenth of June, O. S. the future emblem of the church triumphant, though unhappily as yet, it is but the token *de guerre* of the church militant. Excellent creatures! Your hearts are good, and ſhew you to be of the true-blue ſtamp. But be adviſed, a little more caution will do you no harm: A word in your ear. Will not the old park-keeper at the Manour-houſe be upon the ſtump with you, for ſtanding to argue with the deer-ſtealers in this open unguarded way? That very fine old Gentleman would, I believe, be a little more wary, and not begin to call the commoners theſe naughty names, till he had got them within the length of his quarter-ſtaff, or the point blank of his gun; which ſome people ſay, is not yet the caſe, whatever it may be in a little time. I am,

SIR,

Your conſtant reader,

And humble ſervant,

PICTOR.*

To

* The high churchmen have always been fond of repreſenting the diſſenters under the character of the *wild boar, which breaketh down the fences of the Lord's vineyard:* But this idea becoming ſtale, and having likewiſe a Jewiſh aſpect, the vineyard was turned into a park, and the eſtabliſhed clergy into park-keepers. *Il Moderato* was ſuppoſed to be the ſignature of Archbiſhop *Secker*, who was perfectly infatuated with the idea of an American prelacy. This and the following *Free-Chacer*, written by different hands, ſhew what the attempts of our great churchmen were underſtood to aim at, at that period.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb. 4, 1766.*

MODERATO, in your paper of Jan. 16. miſtakes and miſrepreſents the caſe of the park he mentions, with what view he beſt knows, but moſt probably with a view of ſucceeding the preſent park-keeper. The true ſtate of the caſe is as follows: The paſture ground in queſtion, was, it is true, once incloſed in the manner of a park, by the lord of the ſoil. But the perſons to whom the management of it had been committed, having abuſed their truſt, the lord of the ſoil ſent his ſon and heir to enquire into the particulars, with full powers to make what alterations the nature of the caſe might appear to demand. The ſon, finding the conduct of the park-keepers wholly oppreſſive and unwarrantable, with reſpect both to thoſe who lived within and without the pales, thought proper to *diſpark* the ground formerly incloſed, to break down all partition-walls and pales, and to lay it to the adjoining commons, giving liberty to all who had been hitherto excluded to go in and out, and to find paſture. And leſt this gracious privilege ſhould not be properly notified to the poor people who lived at a diſtance, he commiſſioned a dozen of his own ſervants to diſperſe themſelves over the whole country, and to proclaim theſe glad tidings from one end of it to the other. After which, having provided, and properly authenticated, a re-

record of his proceedings, for the perpetual uſe of all future claimants of a right of paſturage; he returned to his father, leaving behind him the aforementioned twelve ſervants, to order matters for the benefit of the new grantees. While theſe twelve ſervants lived, the paſture remained free and open, to the infinite emolument of many millions who had recourſe to it. But hardly were theſe twelve honeſt ſervants cold in their graves, but a ſet of cunning fellows, picking up all the copies of the original record they could find, pretended, that the ancient park-ground was too good to be made a common, and that it ought to be incloſed again, and produced a ſham record in the place of the authentic one, by which it appeared, that power was given them to incloſe the ſaid paſture ground, and to chuſe one from among themſelves, by the name and title of the *Infallible Park-keeper*. As the poor people, for want of their authentic record, knew not but it might be ſo, they acquieſced in the meaſure. The pales and partition-walls were made ſtrongly up again, and the park ſtocked with deer as formerly. From this period, for a long ſucceſſion of time, the poor people without the pales could not get a bite of graſs for their cattle, or a mouthful of veniſon for themſelves, without paying an exorbitant price to the Park-keeper. At length, a bold fellow, who lived in one of the lodges of the new park, finding accidentally a copy of the original record, and having more honeſtly than his fellows, gave notice to the adjoining country; apprized them from the record of their rights and privileges, and by this means once more opened a part of the park-ground to the free enjoyment of all

all thoſe who were willing to pay their homage to the lord of the ſoil. In proceſs of time, this honeſt and courageous man, having firſt obliged the uſurping park-keeper, and his myrmidons, to coop themſelves up in a narrower compaſs, departed this life. And now come Mr. Moderato's clients upon the ſtage to act their parts. They began with calling the deceaſed a raſh hot-headed man, and perceiving the ſweets of the profits ariſing from the graſs, and the veniſon, they determined once more to make up the fence of their own part of the park, to ſtock it as before, and pronounced all who pretended to come into the paſture without their paſſport (for which they had always a fee) to be deer-ſtealers, thieves, and treſpaſſers. It is true, the record was got into ſo many hands, that theſe new park-keepers could not ſuppreſs it, and on that account the people came at firſt into the propoſal of a new incloſure with great reluctance, which obliged the new park-keepers to act warily; but finding an old writing, called the *primitive code*, for which the infallible park-keeper had no longer any uſe, they tacked this to the original record, affirming that it was a part of it, and having got the country juſtices on their ſide, the poor people, for the moſt part, were obliged to ſubmit; and they who did not, but ſtuck to the original unadulterated record, were branded with the name of deer-ſtealers, &c. Having now rectified *Moderato*'s ſtate of the caſe, I ſhould proceed to his fact and reaſonings; but fearing to take up too much of your paper at this buſy time, I muſt poſtpone the conſideration of theſe to another opportunity; obſerving only for the preſent, what I have often heard Gentlemen

who

who have parks affirm, viz. That they always make the beſt park-keepers, who have formerly been deer-ſtealers themſelves*. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A FREE CHACER.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 6, 1766.

LOOKING the other day into Profeſſor Blackſtone's Commentaries, I found the following paſſage at page 97. "2. Whatever elſe may be "deemed *fundamental* and *eſſential* conditions [of "the union] the preſerving the two churches of "England and Scotl nd in the ſame ſtate that "they were in at the time of the union, and the "maintenance of the acts of uniformity which eſta-"bliſh our common prayer, are expreſsly declared "ſo to be. 3. Therefore any alteration in the "conſtitution of thoſe churches, or in the liturgy "of the church of England, would be an infringe-"ment of thoſe *fundamental* and *eſſential* condi-"tions, and greatly endanger the union."—I muſt confeſs, that I could hardly believe my own eyes, when I read this in a book which has, as I hear, obtained ſome reputation in the world. Was the preſervation of the two churches of England and Scotland *in the ſame ſtate they were then*, the *prime* object of the union, that this ſhould be an *eſſential* and

* *Moderato* was ſuppoſed to have been a diſſenter himſelf.

and *fundamental* condition, in preference and ſuperiority to any other article in it? This I ſaid to myſelf. But was immediately cured of my aſtoniſhment, when I recollected that the doctrine muſt have been hatched in *ſome keen atmoſphere* which has always been famous for keeping the church in ſpirits and vigour, though ſharp enough to wear our civil conſtitution into a conſumption. But, however, it is a comfortable hearing, that alterations in the church would only *endanger* the union. Where any thing of this ſort is only endangered, I ſhould conclude that the ſupreme judicature of Great Britain would eaſily retrieve it, as it is compoſed of both the contracting parties. And had it fallen to my lot to read lectures upon the laws and conſtitution of my country, I ſhould have thought myſelf bound to have told my audience as much. Indeed, it ſhould ſeem by the rules of logic, that an infringement of *eſſential* and *fundamental* conditions, muſt go beyond a ſtate of *danger*, even ſo far as to be fatal to the thing of which ſuch conditions are infringed. But the learned profeſſor probably had his reaſons for ſtopping ſhort, as it would not yet be quite ſeaſonable to own that the church has the whole legiſlature of the united kingdoms at this advantage. But there is another thing in this caſe, which puzzles me extremely. I have read a maxim in more than one law book, that individuals are bound to the obſervance of all laws which are enacted for the good of the whole community. Suppoſe now a Scotchman, or a member in communion with the Scottiſh church (as every Engliſh, as well as Scotch preſbyterian is known to be): Suppoſe, I ſay, ſuch

ſuch a one ſhould come over to the church of England; would not the learned profeſſor's argument bring ſuch a convert in guilty of infringing this *fundamental* and *eſſential* condition of the union? Every law and every contract muſt be founded on ſome reaſon; and what reaſon could the church of Scotland have for ſuch a condition but to keep her members out of the claws of epiſcopacy? But then what work would the learned profeſſor's doctrine make among ſuch individuals? Every one knows that ſuch ſteps have been taken both by Scotch and Engliſh preſbyterians; and ſteps of aſcenſion too, where many of both ſorts are enjoying very comfortable fruits of their *Converſion.* What would they ſay, or how would they look to have it objected to them? "Gentlemen, you have "infringed the fundamental condition of the "union. The church of which you are originally "members, is unalterable. The body is bound by "the act of union not to deſert her members, and "the obligation is undoubtedly, in the intention "of the ſame law, reciprocal, namely, that the "members, ſhould not deſert the body. If you "would therefore act the part of obedient ſons "and loyal ſubjects, you muſt return with all ex-"pedition from whence you came, that the ſin of "endangering the union, be not laid to your "charge." What ſtripping would there be, if this doctrine were to take place? And what burning and ſhining lights would the church, (to ſay nothing of the civil community) loſe, if the worthy profeſſor's law ſhould have its free courſe, and full effect? I do not chuſe to examine the learned profeſſor's ſtatute law by the law of chriſtian

ſtian liberty; I am aware that my mouth would immediately be ſtopped with the old proverb, *when you are at Rome, you muſt do as they do at Rome.* And to this I ſhould readily agree, as I never intend to go to Rome. All that I am contending for is, not to be compelled to do as they do at Rome, whilſt I remain in Great Britain. What may be the caſe in time no body can tell. Some things I own have an aukward aſpect enough; but while we keep as we are, all the profeſſors upon earth ſhall never perſuade me that a Britiſh proteſtant legiſlature deſire to have ſuch an interpretation put upon any law of theirs, much leſs any law concerning religion, as would make it operate in this country, exactly as the Pope's or the church's infallibility operates in Italy or Spain.

I am, SIR,

Your old correſpondent,

And obliged ſervant,

MISOMUMPSIMUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 12, 1766.

I Beg the liberty of conveying, through the channel of your Chronicle, my beſt compliments to the capital C. (who addreſſed himſelf to me in your paper of December 31) and of aſſuring him, that I have very candidly peruſed the late Biſhop Ellys's treatiſes on ſpiritual and temporal liberty, and find them, in ſeveral paſſages, ſophiſtical and inſiduous, with reſpect to both ſorts of liberty. One inſtance may ſuffice, for the preſent, which I the

the rather pitch upon, becauſe it may be verified, p. 48, of an incomparable letter to a R. R. Author, in every body's hands*. Biſhop Ellys, after having excluded the quakers from the benefit of toleration, makes "a general exception (from that benefit) of "errors in religion, which naturally tend to di- "ſturb the civil ſtate, and are hurtful and detri- "mental to it." Now, Why are not theſe errors diſtinctly enumerated? Or, if the poſition is to remain in this captious and equivocal ſtate, who are to be judges? Not ſuch men, I hope, as Biſhop Ellys and the capital C. Judgments on the natural tendency of opinions, prior to viſible effects, are too precarious to be truſted to ſuch men, having been, as the beſt hiſtories inform us, the flimſy pretence for intolerance and perſecution in all popiſh countries by turns. And what the conſequence would be of entruſting ſuch judgments to ſuch men as Biſhop Ellys, and the capital C. may be perceived from

* The letter here referred to, is Dr. *Lowth's* to Biſhop Warburton, which, *incomparable* as it may be in other reſpects, is juſt as exceptionable in the paſſage cited, as Biſhop Ellys's doctrine on the ſubject. For Dr. Lowth not only adopts Biſhop Ellys's limitations of tolerance, but declines to point out the *mark* to which they extend; leaving the door open by that means to the Magiſtrate, to extend his coercive authority in matters of religion to an indefinite length. The Doctor did not remain untold of this. He was ſmartly attacked by Biſhop Warburton's ingenious Second, and, in the opinion of all competent judges, defeated. He was likewiſe taken to taſk in a pamphlet, intituled *The Proteſtant*, or the *Doctrine of Univerſal Liberty aſſerted in oppoſition to* Dr. Lowth's *repreſentation of it in his celebrated letter*. Soon after the appearance of theſe opponents, the Doctor was made a Biſhop, and then—no more controverſy. N. B. The capital C. was ſuppoſed to ſtand for Canterbury.

from the former's excluding quakers (by a deſcription not to be miſtaken) from the benefit of toleration in manifeſt diſparagement of a moſt wiſe law of this country, which, it ſeems, ſaw not natural tendencies in the ſame light that he did. With equal judgment and modeſty does the capital C. inſiſt upon the propriety of a power and authority in the church, with which the church is not, nor, I hope, ever will be intruſted by the Britiſh legiſlature. The prejudice and attachment I have contracted on this and the like ſubjects, blind and mean as the capital C. may think them, I freely confeſs to have derived from Mr. Locke's letters on toleration, which, in my turn, I recommend to the candid and ſerious peruſal of the capital C. And till he hath done this, we hardly ſeem to be upon a level, with reſpect to opening the avenues of our reſpective underſtandings. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 13, 1766.

WHEN the attention of the public began to be turned towards the alarming increaſe of popery, by ſome ſenſible and ſpirited remonſtrances which appeared in the news-papers during the courſe of laſt year, ſeveral of my acquaintance, ſtruck with the importance of the complaint, the un-

undeniable facts on which it was founded, and the neceſſity of redreſſing it, made themſelves ſure that our great churchmen would be the firſt to intereſt themſelves both by paſtoral warnings to their reſpective flocks, and by a proper application to the civil powers, to give a check to a contagion which ſo immediately threatens our happy conſtitution. I own I was of a different opinion, not ſo much from obſerving the early appearance of ſuch blinkers as *Sacerdos Ruſticus** and his mates, as from other circumſtances which lie more remote from common obſervation. But as I might be miſtaken, I forbore to give my reaſons for the judgment I made, till time ſhould diſcover which of us was in the right as to the fact. The year 1765 is now cloſed, and a new one in progreſs, and for any information I can get to the contrary, things remain juſt as they did when the firſt alarm was given. The papiſts go on, and our ſpiritual guides are ſilent. I therefore hope I may now be admitted to aſſign thoſe reaſons which induced me to differ from ſo many of my reſpectable and intelligent friends on the ſubject under conſideration. The moſt effectual way of attacking popery, is by expoſing the uſurpations of her hierarchy, and the rottenneſs of thoſe foundations upon which her whole eccleſiaſtical edifice is built. This was the method taken by ſuch of our divines as wrote with the greateſt ſucceſs in the popiſh controverſy from the reſtoration of Charles II. down to the revolution. One would have hoped that their work had *then* been done. But inſtead of that, the jacobite and nonjuring clergy, joined by a conſiderable number of the ſacred

* Supposed to be the ſignature of a Lambeth Doctor.

ſacred order, who had prevailed with themſelves to take the ſtate oaths, took up the cudgels juſt where the papiſts had been obliged to drop them, alledging, without ſhame or ſcruple, that while the champions of the proteſtant cauſe were battering the fortreſſes of popiſh tyranny, they had likewiſe reduced to rubbiſh a great part of the foundation on which the church of England erected her authority. Every one knows what trouble this high-church combination gave to our glorious deliverer, and to thoſe moderate divines, who eſpouſed his righteous principles of religious liberty, and how unhappily ſucceſsful they were in diſappointing every attempt to reform our motley ſyſtem, upon a more enlarged, original, and conſiſtent plan. In the next reign, Sacheverel, and the church memorialiſts came into faſhion, who painted the church of England with a genuine popiſh countenance, under a proteſtant maſk indeed, but that ſo thin and tranſparent that the Roman features were ſufficiently diſtinguiſhable. Inſomuch that upon the acceſſion of the Houſe of Hanover, the friends of that auſpicious family ſaw with ſurprize and conſternation how pernicious the bolſtering up the claims of church power, muſt prove in the end to the proteſtant ſettlement. Happily for the public, at that criſis, a champion was at hand, the excellent Biſhop Hoadley, who ſhewed, to demonſtration, that if the authority claimed for the church of England by his opponents ſhould be allowed, the church of Rome might make it appear that ſhe had a prior right to it; and upon that ſuppoſition, very juſtly ſtigmatize the proteſtant reformation as ſchiſmatical and rebellious. This, and the like

conſiderations, urged by this incomparable writer, opened the eyes of the whole nation. After a ſhort conflict, the claims of church power were ſilenced. Popery and eccleſiaſtical jacobitiſm were diſgraced and intimidated. Our church leaders were, for the moſt part ſatisfied, or appeared ſo to be, with the province allotted them in the ſcriptures. And we went on, for ſome years, in peace, and, as we thought, in ſecurity from any farther demands of church authority, at leaſt within our own pale. But alas! it was in vain to think of keeping to this golden mean, while the ſweets of eccleſiaſtical domination met with one liquoriſh palate among the ſacred order. Accordingly, when men's jealouſies were ſuppoſed to be ſufficiently laid aſleep, the claim was once more revived, not with the old alarming appearances, but, in the language of the crafts-maſter, in *a new poſture of defence*, where the contrivance was to ſlip in the old pretenſions under the colour of a *new alliance between church and ſtate*. The old high-church ſtagers, indeed, ſtared a little at this project at the firſt, and ſeemed by no means to like it. But a proper cue being given them, they ſoon acquieſced. They were made to underſtand, it was the ſame rope which had been of ſuch ſervice to their forefathers, only that it was now twiſting at a different end: And was equally intended for the ſuffocation of ſuch reprobates as had carried things *ſo much too far*, in the days of their late humiliation. Matters being in this hopeful way, and the benefit of the project having been experimentally proved by repeated trials, and introduced by gradual practice, no wonder the Roman catholics ſhould take freſh courage,

in

in proportion as they ſaw high-church principles recovering ſtrength, which they well knew, notwithſtanding the uncouth guiſe in which they appeared, muſt ſtand or fall with their own original ſyſtem of church power. It would be a reflection upon the ſagacity of our own learned churchmen to ſuppoſe they did not ſee all this, as diſtinctly at leaſt as the Roman catholics. Their looking on what the papiſts are doing without offence, and paſſing by it without obſervation (as one of them ingenuouſly confeſſes they do) would be otherwiſe unaccountable. Nor, indeed, as far as ever I have been able to judge, are our great churchmen at all in humour with thoſe who ſtand to contemplate this phænomenon of daring popery, and ſtill leſs with thoſe who take offence at it. Theſe were my reaſons, Mr. Baldwin, for not expecting any vigorous attack upon popery from our dignified paſtors, or, indeed, from clerks in any ſtation. I know many among the inferior clergy, who perceive plainly enough how the intereſts of the chriſtian religion, as well as thoſe of our civil eſtabliſhment, are affected by popery and a popiſh ſpirit. But they are moſt of them men of ſenſe, and cannot avoid ſeeing, at the ſame time, the track of their own intereſts, and are accordingly ſenſible, that an expectant would make but an aukward figure, who, in the warmth of his purſuit of an object in the likeneſs of the Roman Pontiff, ſhould happen to tread upon the train of a Prelate of ſome other country, and thereby retard his Eminence's progreſſion, when, in the magnification of his office, he was marching in ſtate to communicate the

bleſſings of it to the remoteſt corners of the habitable globe. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

An Unchangeable Whig.

SHAKESPEARE.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Feb.* 18, 1766.

MACBETH. Act IV. Scene I.——The witches,

Round about the cauldron go,
In the poiſon'd entrails *throw.*

"Every thing thrown into the cauldron is par-
"ticularly enumerated, and yet we find no *poi-*
"*ſon'd entrails* amongſt them; or if we did, why
"were they to be thus diſtinguiſhed from the reſt?
"I believe Shakeſpeare wrote,

"*poiſon'd* ENTREMES,

"an old word for *ingredients*, which the editors
"not knowing what to make of, turned to *en-*
"*trails*." WARBURTON.

This hypercriticiſm Mr. Edwards hath properly expoſed; but appears to have ſuſpected that the critic coined the word *entremes*, whereas he only coined the interpretation of it; knowing, indeed, no more the meaning of the word than the editors he cenſures, who probably never ſaw it in their lives.

The

The caſe was this. The R. R. editor had read *Andrew Marvel's Rehearſal Tranſproſed*. And tho' he has ſomewhere a fling at Marvel's *Malignity*, yet has he condeſcended to enrich the Divine Legation with ſome ſprinklings of it; witneſs his *diſorienting* the Divinity Profeſſor at Cambridge.—In this book our critic met with the following period: "I hope, Mr. Bayes, that we ſhall not ſee, "when you have a mind to junket with your com-"fortable importance, that the *entremeſes* ſhall be "of a fanatick's giblets." P. 130, 2d Edit.

Theſe *entremeſes* the critic took for the *ingredients* of Mr. Bayes's collation; utterly unconſcious that as Marvel wrote the word, *entremes* muſt not only be of the ſingular number, but likewiſe a *triſſyllable*, and incapable of ſtanding in the metre. "*Entre-mets*, [or *entre-meſes*] certain choice diſhes, "ſays Cotgrave, ſerved in between the courſes at "a feaſt or a banquet." Hence *entre-met* and *entre mes* in the ſingular number. But the critic taking the word en-tremes for the plural of *entreme* (a word, indeed, of his own coining) put himſelf out of the poſſibility of finding out his miſtake. 'Tis happy for certain critics, commentators, and divines, that the race of Marvels is ſo nearly extinct. After all, it is poſſible, that the word *entrails* might be uſed by the poet, figuratively, for the *entrails*, i. e. the *contents* of the cauldron.

L.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *Feb.* 20, 1766.

ANECDOTE.

YOUR correſpondent from Rome, Mr. Baldwin, is certainly miſtaken concerning the warming-pan. If my information is right, the original *baſſinoire de lit* was brought into Scotland along with its *quondam* contents, in the year 1715: And being forgot in the hurry of decampment, was picked up by an officer, called the *Steward of the Mount*, who honoured it with a place in his collection of *vertu*, having firſt adorned it with an inſcription, viz. *Solis inſtar, calefacio ſimul et fructifico.* It is ſaid to be yet in the poſſeſſion of a deſcendant of the family, and as bright as ever, being wrapt up in the *tandem*-flag to preſerve it from duſt and damp. Upon reading the article from Rome, I was going to cry out after Mr. Bayle, O! the pyrrhoniſm of hiſtory! but have ſince recollected the improbability that there ſhould not be duplicates of ſo precious a relic.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Feb.* 20, 1766.

I Cannot handſomely omit expreſſing my obligations to the capital C for his ſecond admonition, and particularly for the very good prayer at the end

end of it. Methinks we are acting the ſeveral parts of Hothead and Teſtimony in the comedy. But if he has not a greater ſhare of hypocriſy in the exhibition of his part, than I had of boiling wrath upon the occaſion he mentions, we ſhall certainly both of us perform very ill. But as he has now made his exit, his manner muſt be left with the audience. I foreſee, however, that he will have no great ſucceſs in cajoling the diſſenters, whether in the garb of Teſtimony or otherwiſe, upon any future occaſion, while he ſticks to Biſhop Ellys, and an authority to decree rites and ceremonies, and to decide controverſies of faith. My advice to him, therefore, ſhould be to quit the ſtage for good and all, and to authorize ſome other tool to play his parts, who can wear the maſk with a better grace. And if Il Moderato had not repreſented the diſſenters under the figure of rogues and deer-ſtealers, he is the very man I would have recommended for his ſubſtitute. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

Quo ſemel eſt imBUTa *recens ſervabit odorem Teſtadiu.*——

SIR, *March* 1, 1766.

IN a late literary conteſt it was extremely ill taken, and, what is remarkable, it was ill taken

by both ſides, that a caſual expreſſion, viz. *The keen atmoſphere of wholeſome ſeverities*, ſhould be applied to a famous ſeminary, whoſe venerable name ſhould never be mentioned without lifting the hat. For my own part, I am not able to conceive why either plaintiff or defendant ſhould conſider this appellation in the light of a reproach. The names of Laud, Sheldon, Jane, King, &c. &c. may ſerve to remind the moſt ſuperficial reader of Engliſh hiſtory of a multitude of inſtances where wholeſome ſeverities had the happieſt effects, at the ſeveral periods when theſe worthies directed the academical operations of that illuſtrious body. Nor can it be eaſily conjectured what might have been the funereal conſequence, if, upon the demiſe of the laſt named worthy, a *ſuccedaneum* had not been almoſt immediately found to ſupply the place of that ſalutary ſpirit which was cultivated by the deceaſed Doctor, with ſo much care and aſſiduity. As this ſuccedaneous principle was at that time totally new, I am afraid I ſhall hardly make myſelf intelligible to common readers without aſſigning it a patronymic; and that which comes the neareſt to my idea of the thing, is the word imBUTation, in agreement with the hint in my motto. If I am rightly informed, the virtue and efficacy of imBUTation was firſt tried upon this learned community, and anſwered ſo well in the experiment, that all the world ran with as much precipitation to be imBUTed, as people did ſome time before, to be electrified, or as the Americans will run to be confirmed upon the debarkation of their firſt Biſhop. "Whoſoever, ſays a "moſt judicious writer, is neglected or condemned

"by

" by our univerſities, does but vainly ſtruggle to " ſave himſelf from oblivion, while any one they " approve, is ſure to riſe ſuperior over envy." This maxim was never more conſpicuouſly verified, than by the wide ſpreading currency of this noſtrum of imBUTation. This famous ſeminary, having ſet the example by taking the firſt doſe, was followed by perſons of all ranks, denominations, and ſexes. The pulpit, the bar, the ſtage, the tea-table, the *****, the *****, were all imBUTed. And happy, thrice happy for this poor nation, was it that the taſte of the times was ſo uniform. Had it been otherwiſe, we might ſtill have been fighting the French; for, according to my intelligence, a certain great commoner, would never, from that day to this, ſubmit to be imBUTed; and had every body been of his mind, who knows when we might have had a peace? Or had a great financier been as averſe to imBUTation as the great commoner, who would ever have thought of the cyder tax to pay for it? I almoſt tremble to think of the miſchief that ſad dog Wilkes might have done by his Forty-fives, and his Eſſays on Men and Women, if a number of our choiceſt patriots had not gone through a courſe of imBUTation by way of precaution. I forbear to mention the feats it has done in our colonies, and the lucrative returns it has made to thoſe who freighted ſo many veſſels with this ſalutary noſtrum. The laſt wonderful cure it wrought, has been upon Anti-Sejanus, and his fellow labourers, who having taken an overdoſe, which operated in the way of an emetic, fell into a kind of a frenzy, thinking every object they met with was imBUTed;

and, under this unhappy deception, were ready to diſgorge at every turn, as happeneth to thoſe patients who have ſurfeited upon any particular food or phyſic. But, it ſeems, the drug being adminiſtered to them lately, in a more commodious form, it has not only reſtored them to their wits, but brought them likewiſe to eat their bread and butter, without the leaſt ſigns of their former *nauſea*. I could enlarge, Mr. Baldwin, on the virtues of imBUTation for a week together, were I not afraid of tiring your readers. I cannot, however, leave the delectable topic, without expreſſing my anxious apprehenſions, that, as the moſt wholeſome food, and the moſt ſanative phyſic digeſt off in time, ſo without a perennial ſupply of this wonder-working compoſition, we may fall into our old diſtemper of 88, and begin again to rave about our liberties, &c. and drink the glorious and immortal, as ſome of us remember to have done before imBUTation came into faſhion. There is, indeed, one conſolation in my text, which is, that both men and things, which have been ſeaſonably imBUTed, retain the ſmack for a long, very long time: Which, indeed, is the only foundation of the little hope I have, that ſome remnants of this capital bleſſing may reach the times of my grandchildren. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A Cutter out of Work for the Cooper.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March 6, 1766.*

THERE are no men who run a greater riſque of loſing their reputation, than prognoſticating phyſicians, nor was this maxim ever more evidently verified than in the caſe of Doctor Anti-Sejanus, to whom the preſent miniſtry have been patients for ſome months by paſt. Every time he came upon the public ſtage he proclaimed to the multitude that the fatal infection had ſeized every individual of the preſent miniſtry, that they were upon the point of expiring, and that ſuch and ſuch were ſymptoms which they could not poſſibly ſurvive. The miſchief was that theſe mortal ſymptoms varied every day, the old ones diſappeared without doing their errand, and new ones ſucceeded, which were to bring about the long looked-for diſſolution in a trice. At length the chouſed audience began to hiſs and groan, the Merry-Andrew laughed in his face, and the Doctor ſtalked off, to viſit his patients once more, and to find out, or rather to gueſs at ſome new appearance which would more certainly bring on the cataſtrophe. The laſt ſymptom which he gave notice of, that threatened the immediate expiration of the preſent miniſtry, was their reviving the long dormant diſtinction of Whig and Tory. Whether he has really diſcovered this ſymptom in their caſe, I cannot pretend to ſay; but if (as I moſt earneſtly wiſh it may) this token has appeared upon them, I will venture

to prognoſticate in my turn, that it is a happy preſage of health and long life both to them and the public, as it ſhews that they have now diſcovered, and are conſequently in a way to redreſs the real grievances of the people, and to guard againſt a return of them. The quack, indeed, would perſuade us that tories and jacobites are mere non exiſtents, phantoms conjured up to ſerve a miniſterial turn, and that nothing of the kind has been ſeen or heard of in this country ſince the year 1745. To ſuch aſſertions as theſe one need only oppoſe the ſigns of the times, which not long ago appeared with every feature that diſtinguiſhed the moſt remarkable days of the Stuarts, under the profeſſed patronage of this very Anti-Sejanus's maſters. Among other phenomena of the kind appeared general warrants, an extenſion of the exciſe laws, commercial incumbrances upon the colonies of different kinds, &c. &c. On another hand (the conſtant attendants upon a tory miniſtry from the acceſſion of James I. to that of George I. viz.) The increaſe of, and connivance at popery, attempts in the high church clergy to extend the hierarchial juriſdiction to our foreign plantations, their increaſing power and opulence at home, and the many late inſtances of abuſe and contempt of the proteſtant diſſenters, ſuch as the appellation of *deer-ſtealers*, *receipts to make a preſbyterian*, with a long *et cætera* of efforts to bring back the people to a taſte for the civil and eccleſiaſtical government of the diſcarded Stuarts. Theſe I muſt beg leave to call plain ſcorbutic eruptions of toryiſm, leaving thoſe, whom it may concern, to judge to whom the radical cachexy which produced them is to be imputed. A ſenſible obſerving

ſerving man of plain common ſenſe will not eaſily be perſuaded, that theſe appearances can ſubſiſt with a total abſence of jacobitiſm. A Whig Papiſt is a black ſwan which no man ever ſaw, or will ſee; not to mention a lurking remnant of the non-juring tribe, who are, every now and then, ſhooting their bolts from the dark receſſes of treaſon and rebellion. I could give many inſtances of this, but ſhall content myſelf with one. In one of the daily papers of February 20, is advertiſed, *The True-born Engliſhman*, by *Daniel De Foe*, *adorned with an elegant frontiſpiece*. This *elegant frontiſpiece*, is the figure of a young perſonage emblematized with the *Sobieſki*-arms, and every attribute and inſcription that may diſtinguiſh his connections and family, except, perhaps, the *warming-pan*, which the engraver hath unluckily omitted. The verſes under the picture would take up too much room in your paper; but a ſhort explanation of the poiſonous intention of this publication may be neceſſary to undeceive the ſimple minded, who will not, perhaps, readily comprehend the drift of it. Every one knows that De Foe's original intention in publiſhing this ſatyr, was to obviate and ridicule the jacobitical objection to our glorious deliverer William III. that he was not *an Engliſhman born*. The Papiſts and Jacobites think they have now a proper opportunity of turning the ſatyr upon the loyal adherents to the illuſtrious houſes of Naſſau and Hanover. by a moſt wicked malevolent, and treaſonable application of it, to our moſt gracious ſovereign George III. whom God long preſerve and protect from the attempts of his ſecret and open enemies, as well as the ſnares of his falſe friends.

It

It is well remembered that his Majeſty mentioned at his acceſſion, that he was *born among us*. A circumſtance which was not wanted to endear ſo amiable a Prince to an affectionate people, who had been ſo happy for a long courſe of years, under the government of his two excellent grandfathers. This, however, is moſt apparently the circumſtance which gave occaſion to the wicked deviſers of this publication to contraſt his moſt gracious Majeſty's perſon and government with thoſe of a daſtardly fugitive, of uncertain original, bred up in all the bigotry of a blind paganiſh ſuperſtition, a mortal hatred of public liberty civil and religious, and a determined principle of keeping no faith with heretics, of which indeed one of the mottos under the picture, hath unwarily given us a very intelligible hint. Go now moſt excellent Doctor Anti, or rather, perhaps, Profejanus, and perſuade the good people of Britain, that there are no tories or jacobites among them. Boaſt among your new-old allies, that you have taught them to laugh at all notions of prevailing jacobitiſm, that the diſtinctions of whig and tory, are the mere produce of miniſterial craft, a phrenzy which forebodes their final departure, and promiſes an open door for your clients to enter in and take poſſeſſion: which, whatever may be their latent views, may heaven avert, while there is one true-born or true-principled Engliſhman, to preſide in his Majeſty's councils, and warn him of his danger from the vile ſpawn of Loyola, Sacheverel, and Deacon.

I am, SIR,

Your obliged ſervant,

An Unchangeable Whig.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *March* 25, 1766.

I Have evermore been at a loſs to what claſs of beings one ſhould conſign that amphibious animal, called, *A Tory in church, and a Whig in ſtate.* If any man is really in earneſt in aſſerting the civil privileges of the people, he is very ill qualified for his province, if he does not perceive that the moſt modified prerogative of our eſtabliſhed epiſcopal church, is more unfavourable to public liberty, than the prerogative of the crown, even in ſome inſtances where it may ſeem to encroach on the rights and claims of a free people. We have found, by woful experience, that whenever civil oppreſſion hath riſen in this country to the greateſt extremity, it hath ever been abetted, and moſt commonly ſupported by the ſanction of church authority. Our wiſeſt and firmeſt patriots have always been aware of this, and accordingly have generally begun their vindication of public liberty with breaking the influence, and reprobating the maxims of ambitious and pragmatical churchmen. All our hiſtories inform us, that when the people have been in the moſt abject ſtate of bondage under the iron ſceptre of deſpotic power, the church was then in her higheſt glory, riding triumphant in her gilded car, with all her enſigns of dignity and magnificence, diſplayed in the full blaze of hierarchial pomp and parade. And till this eccleſiaſtical pride was ſome way taken down, the ſons of liberty have found

found every avenue to redreſs and relief blocked up, and impregnably fortified againſt their moſt vigorous efforts. In contemplating this caſe, in ſome ſtriking inſtances ſince the earlier dates of our proteſtant reformation, I have thought it a great overſight in the church to leave Engliſh Bibles in the hands of the laiety, as men of the meaneſt capacities might learn from thoſe ſacred oracles, that this kind of external pageantry had no connexion with the real duties of evangelical paſtors. And whenever the laiety have had the good fortune to humble the church in their turn, their ſucceſs hath always appeared to me, to have been owing to the general ſenſe of the nation, founded upon a compariſon between what the church then was, and what, according to the ſcriptures, ſhe ought to be. Far be it from me to ſuggeſt invidious parallels between former and latter times. All my concern is, that my countrymen may not hereafter fall into thoſe dreadful ſufferings under church-tyranny, which our foreſathers ſo ſeverely felt, and from which they were with ſo much difficulty delivered; and a man may well be allowed to entertain a little jealouſy on this head, who ſees no great difference between the general maxims of church government current in the reign of Archbiſhop Laud, and thoſe which are eſpouſed and recommended in the preſent times. This being the caſe with me, I freely own I cannot help foreboding that the practice will become co-extenſive with the principle, the moment, the wealth of the church, which has, for ſome years, been gradually accumulating, ſhall put her into a condition, to demand *that* as her abſolute right,

right, which ſhe now receives, not without a viſible reluctance, as a largeſs, in ſubordination to the civil powers. In one plain word, it is high time for our worthy patriots to take this matter into their moſt ſerious conſideration, and to preſcribe due bounds to the opulence of the church, before public liberty is totally overwhelmed by it. The beſt and readieſt expedient for the purpoſe ſeems to be a new and effectual Mortmain law. I ſay an effectual law, having learned from Dr. Burn how artful and dexterous the clergy have been in eluding the force of Mortmain ſtatutes, at the ſeveral periods when it was thought proper to retard their advancing towards a dangerous independency, by theſe ſalutary proviſions. By an account which was exhibited in the Houſe of Commons in the year 1736, while the laſt Mortmain act was before them, it appeared that in the ſpace of forty years, the lands ſettled in Mortmain, by virtue of licenſes from the crown, amounted, within a trifle, to ſixty thouſand pounds yearly value, excluſive of the purchaſes of many advowſons. How far the laſt Mortmain act hath had its intended effect in putting a ſtop to this pernicious church monopoly, may not, perhaps, be eaſy to learn, as there is no appointment in the act for regiſtering, in any proper office, the donations of ſuch private grantors as have ſurvived the execution of their conveyances of lands to charitable or eccleſiaſtical uſes, twelve calendar months. Perhaps, indeed, this omiſſion in the law might be ſupplied ſome other way. But on another hand, it is certain, that an accurate account might eaſily be obtained of all the lands purchaſed by Queen Anne's bounty ſince that judicious and bene-

beneficial ſcheme of church polity firſt took place; as likewiſe an account of the capital now in the hands of the reſpectable governors of that royal bounty. Theſe helps being obtained, it might not be amiſs to calculate in what number of years the whole lands in Great Britain might be purchaſed by this inexhauſtible fund; or at leaſt in what number of years we might be brought back to that edifying ſtate of eccleſiaſtical dependence, in which King Henry VIII. found us. Theſe, I expect, will be called chimærical apprehenſions; and, indeed, God forbid but the accompliſhment ſhould be at a conſiderable diſtance. In the mean time, however, let it not be forgot that the evil is in a progreſſive ſtate, and that the acceſſion of unalienable landed property to the church, if it is but of a thouſand pounds a year, is juſt ſo much deducted from the ſtrength of the public intereſt, and added to that of an excluſive corporation which has the leſs reaſon to care for the public weal, as it is growing daily more and more able to ſubſiſt of its ſelf. Let thoſe, therefore, whom it may concern, and upon whom it is incumbent, look to the public in due time; otherwiſe it may be in the power of the church, ſooner than they expect, to defeat the moſt ſanguine endeavours of thoſe who love their country well enough to attempt her reſcue amidſt the fire and fury of church artillery, played by the hands of the moſt obſequious mercenaries who may be forced into that quarter for bread, which their impoveriſhed country cannot afford them in another. One word more, Mr Baldwin, by way of hint, and I have done for this time. Without looking ſo far back as the days of old Harry the VIIIth,

VIIIth, let every lover of his country ſeriouſly and impartially judge, how much, and in how many reſpects the face of public liberty would be altered (for the better or for the worſe I do not ſay) if every county in England were ſpiritualized by church leaſes, and church influence thence derived, in the ſame proportion as hath fallen to the ſhare of one, or perhaps two counties to the north of the river Trent. I am,

SIR,

Your obliged ſervant,

PLEBEIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 5, 1766.

IN the excellent Hiſtory of Maſſachuſets Bay, lately publiſhed by Lieutenant Governor Hutchinſon, it is ſaid, "That had the deſign of taking away the charter of that colony in 1638 "been carried into execution, the coloniſts would "probably have gone to the Dutch at Hudſon's "River, who, as the hiſtorian thinks, would have "received them, and granted them thoſe privileges "in matters of government, of which it was the "intention of the Engliſh to deprive them, by taking away their charter." "If they had failed "with the Dutch," continues this reſpectable writer, "ſuch was their reſolution, that they would "have fought a *vacuum domicilium*" (a favourite expreſſion with them) "in ſome parts of the globe, "where they would, according to their apprehen-

"ſions,

" ſions, have been free from the controul of any " European power. Such a ſcheme would have " conſiſted very well with their notions of civil " ſubjection. I do not ſay their notions were *juſt*. " Allegiance, in an Engliſh-born ſubject, is ſaid to " be perpetual, and to accompany him wherever " he goes."

But neither does the judicious hiſtorian ſay the notion of theſe coloniſts was *unjuſt*. And what were his real ſentiments, no man has a right to know. This indelible character of Engliſh allegiance, has of late been the favourite topic with that claſs of lawyers who have appeared in coffee-houſes and elſewhere, as advocates for the power of taxing the colonies, and has been accordingly inſiſted on, as a fundamental and uncontrovertible maxim of law. And it muſt be owned, that many of theſe fundamental maxims, when ſet off with proper decorations, look pretty enough in theory. But the misfortune is, that when they come to be applied in practice, even upon Engliſh ground, they become ſubject to all thoſe limitations and diſtinctions, that create the glorious uncertainty which has been ſo long, and ſo properly, the celebrated toaſt of the long robe. An inſtance of no long ſtanding, will help to explain this matter with reſpect to this article of allegiance.

Doctor Burnet, a native of Scotland, being naturalized in Holland, in order to his marriage with a Lady of that country, gave this as a reaſon why, during his reſidence in the government of the States of Holand, he was not bound to appear to certain criminal letters, iſſued out againſt him in Scotland, by King James II. alledging, in a letter

to

to the Earl of Middleton, that, " During his ſtay " in Holland, his allegiance was tranſlated from " his Majeſty [James II.] to the ſovereignty of " that province." This was enough for James and his miniſters. The firſt indictment was immediately dropped, and another framed, wherein this doctrine of *tranſlated allegiance* was charged upon Burnet as no leſs than high treaſon. Luckily, for the Doctor, he was out of their reach, but was not the leſs awanting to himſelf in ſupporting his plea, ſome particulars of which may not be without their uſe of edifying, even in the preſent times.

" I am told" (ſays the Doctor in another letter to the Earl of Middleton) " that great advantages " have been taken upon an expreſſion in my firſt " letter, in which I writ, that by my naturaliza- " tion during my ſtay here, my allegiance was " tranſlated to the ſovereignty of this province, as " if this alone was crime enough, and, I hear, " that ſome, who have been of the profeſſion of " the law, are of this mind. I, indeed, thought " that none who pretended to ſtudy the law, or " the general notions of entercourſe among na- " tions, could miſtake in ſo clear a point. I cau- " tioned my words, ſo as to ſhew that I conſidered " this tranſlation of my allegiance only as a tem- " porary thing, during my ſtay here. And can " any man be ſo ignorant as to doubt of this? Al- " legiance and protection, are things, by their na- " tures, reciprocal. Since then naturalization " gives a legal protection, there muſt be a return " of allegiance due upon it. I do not deny but " the root of natural allegiance remains, but it is

" cer-

" certainly under a ſuſpenſion while the naturali-
" zed perſon enjoys the protection of the Prince or
" ſtate that has ſo received him."

Common ſenſe tells us, that Dr. Burnet had reaſon on his ſide; and I ſhould be glad to know wherein the acuteſt lawyer in the kingdom would make the caſe of theſe coloniſts (ſuppoſing their intended migration to have taken place) to differ from that of Dr. Burnet? Both conſidered themſelves as out of the protection of the mother-country, upon account of the infringement of their ſeveral rights and privileges ſtipulated to them by the conſtitution of the government. In both caſes therefore the transfer of allegiance would have gone to their protectors, whether theſe were the States of Holland, or the rulers in a new government erected *in vacuo domicilio*. In the maxim quoted from Mr. Hutchinſon's hiſtory, this glutinous property of allegiance ſeems to be attached only to Engliſh-born ſubjects. But as the maxim is a part of the law of nations, it muſt be equally true, and operate equally with reſpect to French, Spaniſh, or German-born ſubjects, as well as Engliſh. And this being the caſe, the doctrine never was, never could be more effectually over-thrown, than it was by the practice of Charles II. The Earl of Feverſham was originally a ſubject of France, but being naturalized in England, the King had ſo little ſcruple of his having a right to the Earl's ſervice, that he employed him to command thoſe troops, that were to be ſent into Flanders in 1678, againſt his natural Prince, with whom, according to Doctor Burnet, the root of his natural allegiance ſtill remained. In one word, the reciproca-

tion

tion of allegiance and protection, is a principle ſo well eſtabliſhed both in the law of nature and of nations, that wherever pacts intervene between the Prince and Subject, it is a jeſt to talk of an allegiance which is perpetual, and accompanies a man wherever he goes. Such an allegiance can belong to no Prince or State, but thoſe who derive their title to govern *jure divino*, from which every oppreſſed ſubject will certainly withdraw himſelf even without aſking leave, whenever he finds an opportunity to put himſelf into a ſtate where his protection may be better ſecured and aſcertained. And I apprehend, all that is meant by the root of natural allegiance remaining, is, that a ſubject, who hath been incorporated into any foreign ſtate, may return to his own country, and claim his native rights, without going through the forms of a freſh naturalization, except in the caſe of outlawry, which ſome great lawyers have not ſcrupled to ſay, ſtrikes at the root of allegiance by the ſame blow which hews down protection.

I am,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

LIBERIUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 8, 1766.

MR. N. R. is extremely unfortunate in bringing Lord Hay's doctrine concerning the repeal of the act againſt *occaſional conformity*, and the act

to prevent the growth of ſchiſm, in ſupport of the Oxford Profeſſor's law, viz. "That the conſtitu-"tion of the church of England, is unalterably "fixed and ſettled by the act of union." The very repeal of thoſe acts, ſhews, that the legiſlature of Great Britain paid not the leaſt regard to the Earl of Iſlay's inference from the *Pacta Conventa* of the treaty of union. "Yes, ſays N. R. this "method of arguing had its effect on the Houſe, "for though the bill paſſed for the repealing thoſe "acts, which had taken place ſince the union; yet "the clauſes, which were derogatory to the teſt "and corporation acts, (which were in force be-"fore the union) were agreed to be left out." Indeed! But if Mr. N. R. had looked into the ſtatute book, he would have ſeen, that the very next act but one to that which repealed the ſchiſm-bill, intituled, *An Act for quieting and eſtabliſhing corporations*, contains clauſes ſufficiently derogatory to the Corporation and Teſt Acts, one of which clauſes repeals a part of the former, and another not only takes out the ſting of the ſacramental teſt with reſpect to by-paſt omiſſions in corporation officers, but limits the operation of it for all time to come. Here then we have an inſtance where the legiſlature controuled the laws for the greater ſecurity of the church of England, enacted *before* the union, unleſs he will ſay the ſecurity of the church of England was never underſtood to have any connexion with the conformity of the civil magiſtrate, in which caſe I ſhall beg leave to refer him to the Vinerian Profeſſor for better information. The truth of the matter is, the Earl of Ilay's method of arguing, made no diſtinction between acts paſſed before

fore and after the union. He plainly thought (or rather perhaps, pretended to think, for he had been turned out of all his employments, and was now an anti-courtier) that the repeal of the Schiſm Bill would as effectually break the *Pacta Conventa*, as the repeal of the Teſt. Earl Cowper was the perſon, who objected to the clauſes relating to the Teſt and Corporation Acts. But he was a better lawyer than to mention the repeal of them as a contravention of the union. He knew better the extent of the authority of the Britiſh legiſlature, compoſed, as it was, of the parties to the *Pacta Conventa* of that treaty. He was, moſt probably, aware, that the acts againſt occaſional conformity, and that to prevent the growth of ſchiſm, were juſt as much breaches of the Union Act, as a repeal of the Teſt and Corporation Acts would be; in as much as the two former acts unfixed and unſettled the bounds of the church of England with a witneſs, by giving her ſo much more power over the diſſenters, than ſhe had before the union. Lord Cowper therefore prudently mentioned the Teſt and Corporation acts, "as the main bulwark of "our conſtitution," and reſted it there, without concerning himſelf with the effect the deciſions of the Britiſh legiſlature might have upon Pacts, which they had the power of correcting or modifying, as new exigencies might give them occaſion.

I am always tender, Mr. Baldwin, of taking up room in your Chronicle, which exhibits ſo many entertaining reſcripts from better hands. I muſt beg leave, however, to be indulged in aſking, what idea a man of liberal and evangelical ſentiments in religion, will naturally form of a writer who triumphs

and exults in the thought, that a thorough reformation in the church, ſo conſtituted as the preſent church of England is, muſt now be deſpaired of? I know ſome very orthodox members of the church of England, attached with great zeal to the preſent eſtabliſhment, only with a fund of better ſenſe, and more candour than the common herd of zealots, who freely acknowledge many inconvenient, and even incongruous, not to ſay inconſiſtent forms and doctrines in our church, which they wiſh (as well as they who ſee more of them) might be removed and exchanged for ſomething more edifying and unexceptionable. And I ſuppoſe the reaſonable part of the world will be of opinion, that a man who does not only *not* join in this wiſh, but is capable of rejoicing in the proſpect that all future reformation in the church of England, is effectually precluded, is fit only to be a member (if he is not one already) of a papiſtical hierarchy, in the literal ſenſe of that expreſſion. I would, however, adviſe Mr. N. R. to be cautious not to puſh the Vinerian Profeſſor's doctrine too far. I know ſome great Clerks of the church of England, and I have heard of more, not in the loweſt ſtations of the church, who think the Engliſh hierarchy not ſufficiently papiſtical (which by the way, Mr. Baldwin, was none of *my* word in my *former* letter) I mean not ſufficiently endowed with power and authority to curb the impertinence of laymen and diſſenters. And as this ſect of orthodox brethren ſeems to be on the increaſing hand, who knows but they may find the *Pacta Conventa* of the union, as much in their way, when the time comes to make their ſpring in

P—r.

P—rl—m—t, as other reformers, are, it ſeems, like to find it in theſe days? Would it not be ſtrange in that caſe, to find N. R. and Co. changing their tone, and preaching the doctrine of the heretical Miſomumpſimus himſelf? Has N. R. conſidered what effect the ſending Biſhops to America would have upon the *Pacta Conventa* of the union? I have been told, by a very eminent lawyer, that the articles of the union are in full force in all our Britiſh colonies. And of this perhaps more hereafter. In the mean time let not N. R. be diſcouraged with the proſpect of being obliged to change his principles with the varying countenance of the times. He may, I dare ſay, find very reſpectable examples of the practice among his own friends. In the mean time, it would be beſt for him to ſit ſtill and look on, leſt (as hath happened to ſome of his fellow-labourers) he ſhould be told by his ſuperiors, that he is likely, by his ill management, to do more harm than good. I am,

SIR, *Yours, &c.*

MISOMUMPSIMUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 19, 1766.

SAuntring into a coffee-houſe the other day, I found two Gentlemen in a warm diſpute, occaſioned by a paragraph in the public prints announcing the declaration of a certain P—r, that he would never more act as a Miniſter of State in this kingdom; and a benevolent wiſh, that ſome able perſons might be found to extricate us out of

our difficulties, &c. One of the disputants strenuously insisted, " that a stronger instance could not " be given of his L—ds—p's good-will to his " country, and affection to his Prince, than this " piece of self-denial, and that whatever his L—d- " s—p's political sentiments might have been for- " merly, it was now plain that he is a thorough " convert, and that nothing could be more unjust " than any insinuation, that he had a remaining " penchant towards any family but the illustrious " one upon the British throne." The other Gentleman, who was much the calmer of the two, took upon him to doubt, first, if any such declaration was ever made, and next concerning the maker of it. " If, says he, it was made by the man " at whom you seem to point, there are facts, not " yet consigned to oblivion, which would admit " of a different construction upon the aforesaid de- " claration. Some people might say, that the last " ministry were dragged through a horsepond or " common-sewer, till being sufficiently bemired, " they were turned off, and delivered over to the " laughter and contempt of the people.—That a " like attempt had been made upon the present " ministry, and, had it succeeded, would proba- " bly have been made upon a third set; and so " on, till all the friends of liberty, and the House " of Hanover, being made odious and unpopular, " a set of trusty confidents might have been intro- " duced, who would have finished the plan with " little opposition. But the scheme being detected, " and the artificers outwitted by the present mini- " sters, and their able coadjutor, the great com- " moner, nothing was now left but a little cant- " ing, by way of currying reconciliation with the

" in

" indignant people; and perhaps covering a march " to a certain point, till a proper opportunity of- " fered of reaping the ripe fruits of the peace of " Fontainebleau."—But the other diſputant ſtill inſiſting, with increaſed energy of voice and action, upon the ſincerity of the converſion, an elderly North-Britain, who had hitherto ſat poring upon a news-paper, rouſed himſelf, and as ſoon as he could catch a pauſe ſufficient to admit of a hearing, delivered himſelf as follows: " Gentlemen, I " have lived in Scotland upwards of thirty years, " and never knew more than *two* parties in that " country; the one attached to the Houſe of Ha- " nover, upon the principles of the revolution; " the other equally zealous for the abdicated fa- " mily of the Stuarts, and their title to dominion " *jure divino:* Nor did I ever know a Scotchman, let " him ſet out upon which of theſe principles he would, " whoever became a *real* convert, by changing " his climate. The way I have always taken to " judge of my countrymen in power, is to obſerve " the complexion and tendency of their meaſures. " If you underſtand each other with reſpect to any " particular object of your conteſt, you are more " likely to know how the caſe hath ſtood, than I " do who am but lately come amongſt you. But " this I know, that ſuch of my countrymen as " were lifted into power, at a certain period, were " not ſuſpected in Scotland, of an enthuſiaſtic at- " tachment to revolution principles; and if you " made any obſervations upon the men of your " own country, who aroſe to honour and influ- " ence at the ſame time, it is not impoſſible that a " ſhorter end may be put to your controverſy,

" than by deſcanting upon declarations, which all-
" powerful neceſſity may force from the human
" tongue upon critical occaſions." Having thus ſaid, this honeſt, ſenſible Caledonian made his bow and retired, and was immediately followed by,

SIR,

Your humble ſervant,

An EVESDROPPER.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *April* 22, 1766.

I Take it for granted, that if ſuch of our Engliſh boroughs as are intituled to ſend members to parliament had been in the ſame ſtate we now find them, at the revolution in 1688, the patriots of thoſe days would have fallen upon ſome methods not only of taking off all reſtraints upon their freedom in matters of election, but of effectually providing that no ſuch reſtraints ſhould be put upon them for the time to come. I ground this preſumption upon a paſſage in the then Prince of Orange's declaration, aſſerting that, " According " to the conſtitution of the Engliſh government, " and immemorial cuſtom, all elections of Parlia- " ment Men ought to be made with AN ENTIRE " LIBERTY, without any ſort of force, or re- " quiring the electors to chuſe ſuch perſons as ſhall " be named to them." It is true this clauſe was aimed at a particular grievance, namely, the garbling corporations by *Quo Warrantos*, new charters, &c. But it is equally true, that the general article in the Declaration of Rights, confirmed afterwards in

in the Convention-Parliament, viz. *The Election of Members of Parliament ought to be free*, was founded upon this doctrine. And if the case of so many of our boroughs had been in those days, what it has been since, it could hardly have escaped the penetration of those able men, who composed that memorable and auspicious assembly, that the inhabitants and residents in borough towns, were equally abridged of their entire liberty, whether the persons required to be chosen were named to them by the King, or by a Nobleman or opulent Commoner, who should get their franchises into their hands by some other means than those practised by James II. I will not pretend to speak to the state of every borough in the kingdom at the time of the revolution, but as far as I have been able to learn, there were very few, if any, among the whole number of English boroughs at that time, which had not their entire liberty in matters of election. It is within my own memory that a very considerable number of boroughs have occasionally exercised their liberty in very vigorous election-contests, which would now in vain attempt to make an opposition to the persons who should be named to them on such occasions. I acknowledge that the boroughs were called the rotten part of our constitution very soon after, if not about the very time of the revolution. But that most probably arose from a very natural reflection, that the electors in borough towns being few, and most of them, generally speaking, traffickers by profession, they might more easily be corrupted than large and numerous bodies of independent freeholders. This however did not hinder but that

the Voters in the leaſt of thoſe boroughs, if they could reſiſt the temptations which generally operated on ſuch occaſions upon individuals, and only for the preſent turn, were at liberty to chuſe the men they liked beſt, and who, in their opinion, might moſt ſafely be truſted with the care of the public intereſt. And till I am convinced of the contrary by other ſort of evidence than any I have yet ſeen, I muſt believe that the wiſeſt man in the Convention-Parliament of 1689 could never have foreſeen from any appearances of that time, either that ſo many Engliſh boroughs would have been monopolized, or that ſuch monopolies would have been confirmed by ſuch ſanctions as no man is at liberty to diſpute. When one conſiders the able and eminent Engliſh Lords, Gentlemen, Lawyers, &c. that were about the perſon of the Prince of Orange when his Declaration was penned, it cannot be ſuppoſed they would dictate, approve, or ſuffer any thing to be inſerted in that inſtrument, which was not grounded upon the moſt indiſputable maxims of law: And it is impoſſible to conceive that any maxims of our law ſhould be more indiſputable than thoſe which have the conſtitution of the Engliſh government, and immemorial cuſtom for their baſis. A good ſubject however will ſuppoſe, that the determinations of every legiſlature are always in perfect agreement with the fundamental principles of that conſtitution, of which it is the guardian and protector, though he may not be ſo happy as to diſcern the connexion in particular caſes. On another hand, hardſhips and grievances are not ſo ſenſibly felt by any, as thoſe upon whom they immediately fall; and experience hath taught

us

us more than once, that occaſional acts of government, though ſtrictly legal in themſelves, may have very unconſtitutional effects in the execution of them. In all or any of theſe caſes, it is the happineſs of the Britiſh Subject, that his Right of petitioning the legiſlature is reſerved to him, which he can never employ upon a caſe more generally intereſting to all his fellow-ſubjects, than this of procuring the Conſtitutional Electors in borough-towns the entire liberty of exerciſing their privileges without any undue influence or controul whatſoever; or elſe procuring ſome alternative in exchange, which may anſwer the end of the public, as well as of the petitioners, much better; and for ever preclude ſelfiſh and ambitious men from making their terms with a corrupt adminiſtration at the expence of their much more honeſt, virtuous, and uſeful fellow-ſubjects. My own borough-intereſt, be it what it will, either for the preſent or in future, any man ſhall have for ſix-pence, and I am now only pleading to increaſe the value of my vote as a freeholder in a county. There are boroughs in every county, and it is of very little ſignificance that the Freeholders of a county can ſend two proper perſons to repreſent them by a free and legal majority, if ſix improper perſons may be ſent upon the ſame errand from three boroughs in the ſame county, (not by a free majority, but) by the voice of a particular man in each borough, who takes upon him to name them, and to require the electors to chuſe them. The fertility of this ſubject, Mr. Baldwin, is ſuch as to make it very difficult to give over writing upon it, when once the ſcribbling fit is ſet in. But I muſt remember the bounds pre-

ſcribed in your paper, and reſerve what I have to ſay upon the ſubject to another time. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

HANSEATICUS.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 3, 1766.

I Have read, ſomewhere, that K. Charles II. told ſomebody, (by way of motive to conformity) that "Preſbytery was not a religion for Gentie-"men." I have likewiſe read elſewhere, that thoſe polite Gentlemen the Jeſuits, who had miſſions in the iſlands of the Archipelago about half a century ago, taught the Catholic children to inſult thoſe of the Greek church with the reproach, that "the Greek ritual was a ritual only for ſlaves "and beggars, upon account of its ſimplicity, "whereas the magnificent Roman ritual was for "Kings and Princes." I ſuppoſe ſome ſuch notions as theſe may have got into the head of your correſpondent *Irritabilis*, who accordingly thinks, and calls me illiberal for making ſo free with his *gentlemanly* church. For my part, I cannot for my life, think the worſe of a goſpel that was intended for the poor, when I hear it preached with *Plebeian* ſimplicity; which ſeemeth likewiſe more ſuitable to the piety of thoſe who worſhip in ſpirit and in truth, than the pomp and parade of cathe-

dra-

dral ſervice. However, I am apt to believe, I might have ſaved the credit of my politeneſs, even with this *irritable Gentleman*, had I but kept my fingers off church revenues and church authority. With reſpect to the latter, indeed, he tells us ſome pretty good news, namely, that the actual power of the church is not adequate to the authority ſhe claims, otherwiſe, it ſeems, poor *Plebeius* might expect to be laſhed without mercy. Now, Mr. Baldwin, it is this ſame laſhing that I am ſo horribly afraid of, both for myſelf and my fellow-Plebeians, and who can blame us for endeavouring to guard againſt it? Every puny politician knows, that actual power follows actual property, and I think I have brought pretty plain proof that the church is improving faſt in actual and ſubſtantial property; and I am ſtill of opinion, that ſhould church property come to figure all over Britain, as it does in one, or perhaps two counties, hinted at in my laſt letter, Mr. *Irritabilis* and his brethren might almoſt as ſafely truſt the deciſion of controverſies, whether of faith or diſcipline, with certain Nobles and Gentlemen, (the preſent ſet of whom, he, with great liberality no doubt, endeavours, by his impotent buffoonry, to make contemptible for their want of judgment and capacity in religious matters) as with the convocation. Not to mention the decency of having the writ *de hæretico comburendo* revived rather by civil authority, than any that ſhould be merely eccleſiaſtical.

But, indeed, he ought to be excuſed, as he makes equally free with the moſt reſpectable and honeſt of his own beloved eccleſiaſtics. They, who

ſhew leſs zeal than he approves for the juſt rights of the church, he calls, time-ſerving prieſts, and it ſeems, by the manner of his introducing the obſervation, as if it was one of his mortifications, that "The Archiepiſcopal See had not lately been "diſgraced with many Lauds."

By the way, one would wonder who, or what it is, that ſets ſuch writers, as this *Irritabilis*, to work. He can, I ſhould think, have very few patrons among the ſuperior claſſes of the eccleſiaſtical order, few of whom, I would willingly hope, are ſo very ignorant as to ſuppoſe the church, to which our Saviour refers the cenſure of a treſpaſſing brother, Mat. xviii. was made up of eccleſiaſtics only. On another hand, where muſt the man have lived, with whom muſt he have converſed, and with what religious body muſt he have aſſociated, who is capable of aſſerting in this *yet* proteſtant country, that "unleſs ſomebody muſt "decide controverſies of faith that ariſe, nothing "but confuſion muſt enſue." There was, indeed, confuſion enough upon this ſubject, while the Stuarts and the Lauds preſided among us; but ſince the Toleration Act took place, the confuſion ſeems to have pretty well ſubſided, and I think is not very likely to return, except in the caſe, againſt which I am endeavouring, all along, to warn my countrymen, namely, an overgrown opulence, and conſequently an overgrown power in the eſtabliſhed church. In the preſent ſtate of things every man, as far as I ſee, may go quietly to his own judge of controverſies, without ſquabbling with his neighbour for going to another. *Irritabilis* and his fellows have recourſe, it ſeems,

to

to their Convocation-men. The Presbyterians to their Classes and Synods. The Independents to their Congregational Elders. The Methodists to Messieurs Wesley, Whitfield, Ingham, &c. The Quakers to Robert Barclay and George Fox. And here and there, perhaps, a good christian in a corner, who professes himself of no sect, may be contented to quiet his own doubts and difficulties by the plain sense of the christian scriptures, as far as he is inabled by his own rational faculties and common sense to understand them. In all this there is no confusion, nor, indeed, any inconvenience, and, perhaps, upon the whole, some edification. For should matters proceed to written controversy, this has its uses. Readers of common sense seem pretty generally, to make the necessary distinctions. They know that pride, passion, ignorance, and prejudice, are fit only to be despised and laughed at. But serious and sober debate, managed with temper and judgment between opposite parties, hardly ever fails to leave some good behind it: Perhaps some useful information, where the reader might not look for it. And while matters continue upon this footing, what must the patrons and protectors of christian liberty think of an injudicious zealot, who would monopolize the decision of controversies into the hands of a convocation, with such men as a Jane or an Atterbury at its head? Why not go at once to the Pope and his Cardinals? That Popery has increased, both in numbers and insolence, is too melancholy a truth to be lightly and ludicrously treated, and too visible to be denied. That our leading pastors take little notice of this alarming danger, is matter of frequent and loud complaint,

with

with what reaſon and juſtice let thoſe conſider, who are chiefly concerned to note it. But ſurely it is to inſult the common ſenſe of the public, to pretend that this is owing to the circumſtance, "that Biſhops are obliged to grant licences for "religious worſhip," to men who are *not* papiſts. For the reſt, there might be ſome colour for reviving the old ſtale calumny of popiſh prieſts and jeſuits harbouring among methodiſts and diſſenters, if popery had occaſion at this day for any ſuch ſubterfuges. But it is well known it has not. It appears barefaced in defiance of the law, and in ſome places which might be mentioned, makes a much more ſplendid and conſpicuous figure than many congregations of loyal proteſtants, who, with a full toleration from the righteous laws of their country, have much leſs perſonal reſpect and eſteem ſhewn them by ſome, who would take it extremely ill not to be reckoned among the pillars and bulwarks of the proteſtant church of England. I ſhould be ſorry to have it thought that I have treated *Irritabilis* with diſreſpect, becauſe I think myſelf really obliged to him. Nothing could more evidently prove the ſeaſonableneſs of my admonitions and warnings to the public, than ſo much ſpleen and bitterneſs againſt proteſtant diſſenters; ſo much tenderneſs towards the papiſts, and ſo great an impatience to be ſoaring on the wings of a prelatical hierarchy, as are exhibited in this and ſome other attacks on my lucubrations, which have occaſionally appeared in your Chronicle, as well as in ſome other prints of the day, or the week.

I am, SIR, *Yours, &c.*

PLEBEIUS.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May 6, 1766.*

GREAT is the force of truth, and it prevaileth: A maxim never more ſtrongly exemplifyed, than in a letter ſigned T[illegible], in your Chronicle of Thurſday April 24, where a true Brimſtone-blue Son of the Church (of what denomination, is not hard to gueſs) attempts to give ſome reaſons why the popiſh emiſſaries convert none of the (proteſtant) Diſſenters. After having made uſe of ſome of the nonſenſical topics of Papiſts and Jacobites to abuſe this reſpectable body of his Majeſty's ſubjects; and after employing the witty malice and virulence of the conſcientious Swift to ridicule them, he moſt unluckily ends his homily with the following ſimile. "As when a prudent Gene-" ral, with hoſtile arms, invades the territories of " ſome neighbouring ſtate, he firſt tries to corrupt " and bring over thoſe whom he can imagine to " be in the leaſt favourably diſpoſed to him, and " takes in the leſſer and more diſtant ſorts, that " he may leave no enemy behind his back, before " he ventures to attack the principal citadel: So—" What? Why nothing, but an *etcætera*. But why ſhould he ſuppreſs the other member of the compariſon? For reaſons, no doubt, of his own ſort, by which, however, I have no occaſion to be bound, and will, therefore finiſh his work for him, for which,

which, if it is not done to his mind, he has nobody to blame but himself.—"So the prudent "popish General finds it expedient to begin with "the church established, of whose corruptibily and "favourable disposition towards his cause, he has "the less reason to doubt, as she is so fond of rites "and usages which both churches agree to call "primitive; as likewise of the absolute essentiality "of Episcopacy to a christian church, in which "they both agree; and to perfect his scheme, he "takes in, first the lesser and more distant forts, "namely, country parishes, many of which are "sometimes put under the care of one Governor, "who, besides his inclination to favour the adver-"sary, is seldom to be found at his post, but "leaves the care of the garrison to some poor un-"skilful half pay Lieutenant, while he himself, is "taking his diversion, or perhaps soliciting another "additional government; and by this means the "forts and the garrisons fall an easy prey to the "politic General, who well knows, that the rene-"gado troops, thus gained over, will fight, with "as much fury, as his own original regiments a-"gainst the dissenters," whom he here compliments with the title of the principal Citadel, *i. e.* in other words, the chief bulwark of the reformation. Surely the church of England is most highly obliged to this teller of truth, and will, no doubt, reward him with some half-dozen of these forts, which, as appears by this specimen of his talents, he is so able to defend. I am,

SIR,

Your humble servant,

ITHURIEL.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May 6, 1766.*

RIGHT glad was I, Mr. Baldwin, to ſee my old acquaintance *Il Moderato* once more in your Chronicle of April 22, and what added to my pleaſure was to ſee him in an employment ſo much more creditable, than that of paling up and hornifying the reaſonable and free inhabitants of this chriſtian country in an eccleſiaſtical park. The objects of his cenſure are, on the preſent occaſion, two of the Park-keepers*, who it ſeems, have fallen out; and the office which *Il Moderato* hath taken upon him, is that of ſtaving and tailing between the combatants. I borrow the metaphor from Hudibras, leaving it to the reader's conſideration how far it may be properly applied. The office of peacemaker is on ſome occaſions extremely laudable, but when, as I ſuſpect the caſe may be at preſent, they who pretend to labour for peace, are under that diſguiſe, making themſelves and others ready for battle, I cannot but withhold my commendations till I ſee more of events. The merits of the debate between the ingenious Prelate and the learned Profeſſor, do not ſeem to lie within ſo ſmall a compaſs as *Il Moderato* may imagine. Be that as it may, it appears in the progeſs of it, that

* This is ſuppoſed to allude to a certain Profeſſor's letter to a certain Biſhop.

that the one is charged with being extremely tender on the head of idolatry, and the other on the article of intolerance, and these, I apprehend, are the only two points of this controversy in which the public can have any great concern. As both these Geniuses therefore, seem to be pretty tenacious of their several opinions, the best effects I can foresee from their reconciliation, are, on the one hand, more favour shewn to papists, and, on the other, less to protestant dissenters: An event, which, if I mistake not Mr. Moderato's complexion, would not be disagreeable to him. I heartily agree with him in resenting the usage of the great Bentley, in the letter of the learned, and, on other occasions, neither injudicious nor uncandid Professor. If I am rightly informed, the said Bentley has been sometimes in the good, and sometimes in the bad graces of the other, as the particular business of flagellation in hand seemed to require. However, I shall never think either of them disparaged by the critic, who should say, That Bentley was as great a man as either of them; not particularly for his confutation of Spinozism, but equally at least for exposing the hucksters of the Word of God, of all professions, in his excellent sermon against popery. Upon the whole, though *Il Moderato* may, perhaps, like the Professor's limited notions of toleration well enough, yet he seems to me to think the alliance the more substantial service of the two, as doing the business of the church more effectually, and on that account, I dare say, is disposed to tilt the balance, as he does, on that side. Happily, however for the Professor, there are some sorts of controvertists against whom any man may write, in

what

what ſtyle, and in what manner he pleaſes, without loſing any reputation; eſpecially as the laws of retalliation are current enough in the land of controverſy, to exculpate the worthy Profeſſor in every tittle of his letter while he ſticks to his object, and there I am obliged to leave him. I have amuſed myſelf above, with ſome of the diſagreeable effects of the reconciliation propoſed by *Il Moderato*. But there are ſome others at which I am almoſt tempted to ſmile. Should the treaty go forwards, What muſt become of the great Ruſſian Legiſlator, Captain Merdaille*? Who, it is likely would not be comprehended in it, as neither ſide probably would think him worth owning. As for Manuail and Spadaſſin†, terms muſt be made for them, becauſe however quiet, and peaceable all things might be on the part of the Profeſſor, it is not impoſſible but ſome thick-and-thin work may ariſe from another quarter where their ſort of parts and induſtry cannot be ſpared. It is hoped, by myſelf at leaſt, that we ſhall have ſome farther revelations on this head from the pious and peaceable *Il Moderato*, till when I ſuſpend my conjectures, and remain, Mr Baldwin,

Your obliged ſervant,

A FREE CHACER.

To

* The late Dr. Browne is ſaid to have applied this abuſive name to himſelf, nor did the author of the letter cleverly acquit himſelf of the charge of pointing at the Doctor as one of his correſpondent's beadles.

† The world applied theſe names to two Gentlemen of diſtinguiſhed literary merit, one of whom took his ſatisfaction like a man of ſenſe and a ſcholar, in an excellent anſwer to the Profeſſor's letter.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 10, 1766.

PLEASE to inſert at your leiſure, and when you have room, the following anſwers to the queries in the St. James's Chronicle of April 26.

1. The circumſtance which renders the word hierarchy approbrious, when applied to any church-eſtabliſhment, is the ſpecific epithet *prelatical*.

2. A preſbyterial government may be termed an hierarchy, and when governing preſbyters act upon prelatical maxims, is then ſo termed opprobriouſly.

3. The inconveniences and miſchiefs ariſing from the over-grown revenues of the church, are a proper object of the conſideration of the legiſlature, who, if they conſider them properly, will not leave it at the option either of prelates, or preſbyters, to accept or refuſe the preciſe portion of lands and demeſnes, hitherto belonging to the church of England.

4. Whether preſbyters would accept of the dignities annexed to miniſterial offices in the church of England or no, is not material. A wiſe legiſlature will never lay them under the temptation.

5. Preſbyters, I ſuppoſe, have ſome methods of providing for the maintenance of their miniſters already. The ſuppoſition in this query, that miniſters cannot be provided for otherwiſe than by the form of church government, exerciſed by our pre-

preſent prelatical hierarchy, is falſe and fallacious.

6. Many poor clergy of the church of England want bread, or have only a bare neceſſary pittance of it, while the footmen and poſtillions of their ſuperiors have bread enough, and to ſpare. And the grievance is, that our churchmen are ſolliciting the laity to provide for theſe miſerables, while they themſelves have engroſſed the portions that ſhould (and would more than ſufficiently) maintain them. If the revenues of the church were to be diſtributed in proportion to the ſubſtantial duties required to be done by chriſtian miniſters, to the real edification of a chriſtian people, they would be found ſufficient to maintain all the epiſcopal and all the preſbyterian miniſters in the kingdom of England.

7. I ſhould think that preſbyterial polity is not founded on a republican ſyſtem, as preſbyterial church government is exerciſed in Scotland in perfect conſiſtency with the monarchical ſyſtem. Is not the queriſt here playing an empty hypotheſis againſt the plaineſt matter of fact?

8. Monarchy may very well conſiſt in England, or any where elſe, with any truly chriſtian form of church government, by whatever denomination the paſtors of ſuch chriſtian churches are diſtinguiſhed.

9. The legiſlature of Great Britain, conſiſting of the contracting parties at the union, may change and alter the mode of church government in England, or Scotland, in whatſoever manner they ſhall judge to be better upon the whole for the ſubjects of the united iſland, without the leaſt violation of the

the treaty of union. The legiſlature hath made remarkable alterations with reſpect to the certain articles ſuppoſed to be meant by the queriſt, and what is perhaps a ſecret to the ſaid queriſt, made theſe alterations when a tory church-miniſtry was at the helm of affairs.

10. Toleration, and indulgence, whenever and whatever alterations may hereafter be made in our church-polity, will, we truſt, always be in the hands of a righteous truly proteſtant Britiſh legiſlature, and extended equally to all proteſtants, and to all religions whoſe principles are not deſtructive to our proteſtant ſettlement, or inconſiſtent with the welfare and ſafety of civil ſociety, and never truſted either to the diſcretion or the principles of political churchmen of any denomination whatever. The impertinence of the queriſt's citations from hiſtory, proceeding upon the ignorant or malevolent ſuppoſition that the Scots of the preſent age are the ſame narrow-ſpirited people with their forefathers, needs no other confutation than the leaſt acquaintance with the moſt worthy, ſenſible, and conſiderable inhabitants of that part of the united kingdom. What ſuſpicions of a Laudæan intolerance are left by theſe queries upon the preſent church of England, it behoves this queriſt to conſider. I am perſuaded that the moſt rational and chriſtian part of his fellow-members will utterly diſown him.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A Plain Anſwerer.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 13, 1766.

THE cenſors of the preſent adminiſtration ſeem to be more particularly exaſperated againſt Mr Pitt, and expreſs their animoſity with a remarkable virulence. Mr Pitt's Advocates, on the other hand, call this ingratitude, and put theſe gentlemen in mind of the glorious ſucceſſes, for which the nation in general ſtands indebted to their client while he was at the helm. But, for my part, I cannot help thinking this way of anſwering Mr Pitt's adverſaries to have ſomething in it of impropriety. Ingratitude is a term relative to obligations ſuppoſed to be conferred on the ungrateful party; and I do not think it would be eaſy to ſhew that theſe writers, and their patrons, are at all obliged to Mr Pitt on account of the ſervices above-mentioned. If I miſtake not their complexion, it could by no means be agreeable to them to have the poor Frenchmen ſo miſerably drubbed by ſea and land, and in a way to be reduced (as moſt probably they would have been) to an utter incapacity of lending their aid for one half-century, at leaſt, towards the accompliſhment of a certain project, which honeſt ſtaunch tories always keep in view. Mr Pitt's reſignation, would be conſidered by them as a deliverence from the brink of deſpair; and the pacific operations of his ſucceſſors, as a return of the Utrecht-Jubilee after the uſual interval of fifty

fifty years. And here it is we are to look for the demands upon tory gratitude; which indeed have been duly discharged by Auditors, Britons, Anti-Sejanuses, and others in the pay of the party. In one word, the pacification, if one may judge from their writings at that time, was looked upon by them as an happy re-adjustment of their affairs, under the auspices of a chief, whose country, principles, and connexions, conspired to afford them ample security, as they thought, that neither time nor accidents could disconcert their plan; which presently began to develop itself in various acts of power and oppression, for which toryism never wanted a justification, even amidst the most affecting remonstrances of an injured and irritated people. The precise provocation therefore, that Mr Pitt hath given to this party more lately, consists in his breaking its influence at a time, when not a Tory among them had any conception that it could be broken. Accordingly we find in their diurnal and hebdomadal squibs, evident marks of astonishment and consternation, as well as of rage and disappointment. And what wonder? The most sanguine Whig in Britain, who had cast his eye, a-while ago, over the list of their effective men, could hardly have hoped that so formidable a combination would have been dissolved without a miracle. In the department of the state, they had their Sejanuses, Gentle Shepherds, Twitchers, Weavers, with a long *et cætera* of political Pedlars, and the whole procession of retainers to the cocoa tree. In the law-quarter, striking exemplars of the great antitypes Berkeley, Noy, Jefferies, Makenzie, and other adepts in crown and prerogative lore. Nor were

were they without their Muſties, Legates, Eſtimators, Detectors, &c. in the Church, not to mention a long liſt of ſupples, who, in the full vigour of expectancy, were ready to undergo all the perils of poetry and proſe, which threaten time-ſerving pedants of the order with the ignominy of proſtitution, in caſe their pilots ſhould be waſhed overboard, or otherwiſe ſuperſeded in the ſteerage. And let it not be imagined, that this inundation of toryiſm broke in upon us at once. Channels had long been opening for it, by a variety of adventures in the republic of letters, and that in times when we had no apprehenſion of the ſequel, and when the ſecret of its progreſs and deſtination was only in the conclave of a few choice ſpirits, whom their emerging from inferiority to ſublimer ſtations hath ſince pointed out. Theſe implements occupied the ſeveral departments of authorſhip, according as their reſpective talents might be turned to the account of their leaders. Some of them commenced hiſtorians, whoſe taſk was to varniſh the Stuart Race, and to qualify the prejudices which had been impreſſed by writers of more veracity. One of theſe, fearing to be too late for events, began a hiſtory of Great Britain at the acceſſion of the Stuarts; but finding afterwards that he had time upon his hands, he went back to the Tudors, with the more alacrity, as an account of their times afforded him ample occaſion of abuſing the firſt proteſtant reformers. Another, who, at his firſt ſetting out, was but in indifferent bread, finding his ſtory-book went off heavily, bethought himſelf of publiſhing by piecemeal, and of ſelling cheap, gaining by this method, the ſeveral advantages of quicker returns,

and of retailing his drugs to a greater number of individuals. Beſides theſe ſingle hands, there were groupes of romancers, who as occaſion ſerved, took various opportunities of ſtigmatizing the characters of the moſt eminent and renowned friends of public liberty, and of blanching the reputation of the patrons and promoters of bigotry, intolerance, tyranny, and arbitrary power. Nor muſt the merit of a famous Dictionary-maker be forgot, who taſked himſelf to coin ſuch ſignifications of Engliſh words, as might brand the principles of the whigs with every odious idea, and give a ſterling currency to the deſpicable cant of toryiſm. The time would fail me to enumerate the motley verſatile train of reviewers, magaziners, and other periodical critics and politicians, who exerted themſelves in this warfare, and who, when the ſun of toryiſm had aſcended to its meridian, were placed, penſioned, and promiſed, in proportion, not ſo much to their bypaſt ſervices, as to the miſchief they might do ſhould they be ſtarved into recantations. Who that contemplated this complicated engine of tory deſpotiſm a year ago, durſt have preſaged its ſo ſudden ſubverſion, and that by the ſteadineſs of a few patriots, whom their averſaries, in the plenitude of their contempt for them, dignified with the name of old women and children? Who would have thought that the perſonal abilities and probity of one man, without any external aid, but the happy coincidence of his own noble ſentiments, with the ſpirit and feelings of a ſenſible people, would have given the *coup de grace* to this powerful cabal, and have deprived them, ſupported as they were, of the preſent means, at leaſt, of doing more miſchief?

I ſay of the *preſent* means; for it is not impoſſible that tory influence may once more prevail; and that the hope of that event is not extinguiſhed, the repeated abuſe and malevolence againſt our great patriot, thrown out in daily ſquibs and in different forms, is more than a thouſand ſworn witneſſes. It behoves my countrymen to be upon their guard, to keep their eye ſteady upon the Great Commoner, as the perſon who is, moſt viſibly at leaſt, employed to cultivate that harmony between a gracious King and a loyal people, which only can derive upon us the fruits of thoſe ſtruggles, that our forefathers ſo chearfully and reſolutely went through, to place the imperial Crown of Great Britain on the heads of the illuſtrious houſe of Brunſwick. Depend upon it, every railer at this great man, has in his eye ſome thing more than the revival of General Warrants and Stamp Acts, which were but preludes to other deſigns, that *even yet may* be in agitation, though enſconced for the preſent under the ſhade of a double curtain. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

*An Unchargeable Whig.**

* When the hopes of this ſanguine writer were ſoon after his delivering theſe ſentiments, ſo unexpectedly diſappointed, one of the fraternity gave him a ſly hint, that he had been a little premature in his prognoſtications: He anſwered, "You "may ſee, however, in the end of my letter, the ſpirit of "prophecy had not quite left me."

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 17, 1766.

WHAT, Mr. Baldwin! ſend the very flower of our ſhipwrights to the dock-yards of the Baltic, when our American brethren are in the utmoſt diſtreſs for thoſe artificers, and when the enemy is in full ſail to take advantage of their nakedneſs? What are the Conſtitutionaliſt and his coadjutors doing to let this ſoleciſm in politics ſlip without any wholeſome animadverſion? Of what importance to their country is their drenching their throats with porter, in compariſon of their opening them to roar againſt this abſurdity? But be not too much alarmed, honeſt reader; all this is but by way of ſimile, a kind of parallel caſe to another piece of falſe policy, which, however, ſome ſerious men think of equal detriment to the public weal. In one melancholy word, the public prints announce the exportation of our capital Theoriſt in Legiſlation, to the Ruſſian Court, and that too at the very inſtant when the old Fox of the Vatican (if the ſame prints are to be credited) hath obtained leave to ſhip one of his Biſhops for Canada on board his own gallies, with all the valuables belonging to his profeſſion. The next intelligence we have in the very ſame paper is of an "handſome benefaction lately left by a Gentleman "towards the eſtabliſhment of epiſcopacy in our "colonies and ſettlements abroad, accompanied "with

" with an hint, how ſtrongly recommended this " meaſure has been by many well-wiſhers to the " church of England." This handſome benefaction muſt be a decent proviſion for half a ſcore American Biſhops at leaſt. But what occaſion for parting with ſo many of our domeſtic luminaries at once, when we have one at hand *inſtar omnium*, who with his code of legiſlation in his baggage, would be able not only to counterwork the Canada mitre, but to drive all America before him, I mean ſuch parts of it as ſhould not ſubmit to be quietly led. I do not think that the Britons of the preſent hour will make a worſe figure in any part of their future hiſtory, than in the page where it ſhall be told, how inſenſible they have been to the accompliſhments of this Demi-Coloſſus, while even the tardy Muſcovite hath diſcovered, properly eſtimated, and is ſo ready to do them full juſtice. But what ſignify remonſtrances ſo far out of ſeaſon? I very much queſtion whether, if, in the way of temptation, an American Rochet were to be expanded, with the addition of a triple crown, held up by the hands of thoſe who are all vigilance and anxiety for the ſpiritual welfare of New England, even this ſplendid plumage would not be looked upon by the ſlighted worthy, with the indignant, diſdainful eye of diſguſted merit. What a pity it is that the puny make of ſuch of us mortals as are endowed with gigantic intellects, will not permit us to *beſtride* the narrow world *literally?* What an immenſe bleſſing to two quarters of the globe would this legiſlator be, with one foot fixed in Peterſburgh, and the other in Boſton; dictating by turns to the political Liliputians in theſe ſeveral

departments, and civilizing the ſavages in the one, and the very bears in the other! But as this is too far out of the reach of ſo diminutive a frame, all the conſolation we can have, is to anticipate in our reveries, the glorious fruits her Czariſh Majeſty, and her ſubjects will reap from this rich acquiſition. I have ſuffered myſelf, in a doubting hour, to queſtion, whether this accompliſhed undertaker, would be as happy in taking meaſure of the principles and manners of the Ruſſians, as he was in eſtimating thoſe of his own country. Effeminacy in thoſe days was our characteriſtic, which this Gentleman ſo effectually diſcredited in the nick of time, that it is to this hour a problem, with himſelf at leaſt, whether our ſucceſſes in the laſt war were owing to Mr. Pitt's meaſures, or to his ſeaſonable and animating remonſtrances. The character of the Ruſſians vergeth, I am told, towards another extreme; and though the late Czar Peter, had tolerable ſucceſs in ſhaving and curtailing them, yet, it ſeems, there are certain aſperities and ſuperfluities left in their manners, which may ſeem to require the niceſt and moſt maſterly touches of civiliization to poliſh off, without ſtirring up the impatience of thoſe who are deſtined to undergo the operation. I have ſo little knowledge of Ruſſia, and ſo little connexion with thoſe who have more, that I have not been able to learn, whether her Imperial Majeſty has yet been let into the ſecret of grey-powder. Perhaps the receipt may be among the valuables of the code, and one of the recommendatory articles which procured the invitation. Be that as it will, I would not be the man who ſhould undertake to pul-

pulverize the wives and daughters of the citizens and burghers of Peterſburgh, even under the protection of the Czarina herſelf. For aught I know, they may have heard the ſtory of the Beavers and long Clokes at Madrid, and were I in the legiſlator's ſhoes, I ſhould have a mortal averſion to be *ſquil'aced*. But theſe apprehenſions, I own, are much below both the talents and courage of our adventurer. However, the wiſeſt men are commonly the moſt cautious. And as we learned from your Chronicle, Mr. Baldwin, a few days ago, by what ſtratagem the Italian Marquis made his eſcape from Spain, I would humbly adviſe the hero of my tale, to lay in an expedient of the like kind againſt a cloudy day: And if that arch lad, who, ſome few years ago, came to ſeek his maſter upon the ſtage, is to be had for love or money, I certainly would, if bound to Ruſſia upon a like adventure, ſecure him to ſtand between me and danger, in caſe of any untoward accident upon the developement of the code. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

*A Newcaſtle Fitter.**

* The unfortunate and much injured Dr. Browne was amuſed with a propoſal of his going to Ruſſia with a bountiful ſtipend, as a public Profeſſor in an Academy to be founded by the Sovereign of that country. Some, to whom the Doctor's talents were an eye-ſore, encouraged him in the project. But the Doctor finding in the event, that neither the poſt intended for him was a poſt of honour, nor the emolument adequate to the drudgery of it, he delined it with a generous reſentment, which unhappily had a fatal effect. *See* a paper in

To the PRINTER

SIR, *May* 20, 1766.

THERE is abſolutely no dealing with theſe Oxford Wags, (and particularly the facetious *Gratus*, in your Chronicle of the 8th inſtant) who are ſo arch on the writers againſt popery, and ſo clever at pelting them with claſſical ſcraps. However, they ſhould take care not to overſhoot the mark, leſt they ſhould break the heads of ſome of their beſt friends. The maxim, "that every "man cannot afford to go a whoring to Corinth," which *Gratus*, I dare ſay, aimed at the members of preſbyterian academies, is capable of a very perverſe interpretation, if Corinth ſtands, as he ſeems to have intended it, for a certain ſeminary, where it is to be underſtood, according to this proverb, that the meretricious learning there to be acquired, is

in this collection, ſigned ÆACUS, October 16, 1766. The Doctor's foible was vanity; and the gratification of it tempted him into connections with ſome who were enemies to civil and eccleſiaſtical liberty. He joined them in the cry of, *faction!* and *Eccentiouſneſs!* and thereby purchaſed the reproof in this letter at a time when the iniquitous conſpiracy of his quondam patrons, and ſtill pretended friends was very little known, though long ſuſpected by ſome of the Doctor's real well-wiſhers; and it is ſaid, that an expreſſion or two in this very letter, gave the Doctor the firſt idea of his being duped in this Ruſſian buſineſs by one to whom he had been a little too profuſe in his devoirs, at his entrance into the ſtate of authorſhip.

is not adequate to the exorbitant price to be paid for it. A circumſtance which hath of old been matter of ſerious complaint. However, I do not ſee why a joker, who thinks proper to laugh upon a grave ſubject, ſhould not keep to truth. *Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?* Now unleſs ſome Oxford critic has ſuggeſted to Gratus, that inſtead of *dicere verum*, we ſhould read *mentiri*, he ſhould have ſaid, that (not the abilities, but) the willingneſs of church of England-men to write againſt popery, was the thing ſuppoſed to be wanting, by Miſomumpſimus and his fellows. It ſeems, that the four able writers againſt Philips, the biographer of Cardinal Pole, were bred at Oxford. Wherever they were bred, they ought to be highly honoured for that ſeaſonable ſervice to the proteſtant religion; and not the leſs for that incident in their hiſtory. Locke was bred at Oxford as well as they, and ſome good things may be learned every where. Neither Locke, nor, as far as I can find, theſe four excellent writers were Gremials of Oxford, when they publiſhed their reſpective works ſo friendly to liberty and the proteſtant reformation; and it has often been known, that men of good ſenſe and liberal minds, after having been emancipated from the *atmoſphere* of their early education for ſome conſiderable time, have totally thrown off the narrow prejudices of their firſt inſtitution. Has Gratus never heard of ſuch, who imbibed their firſt rudiments in academies of preſbyters? But if theſe four worthies are to be placed in the column of creditor in the account; let us look at the balance on the debtor-ſide: Where was Philips' Life of Cardinal Pole printed? Where were two late Profeſſors

nouriſhed, one of whom has been openly charged with holding principles of intolerance, and the other with a doctrine concerning proteſtant church eſtabliſhments, which can have no foundation, but where popiſh infallibility is acknowledged? The Cambridge men are, I ſuppoſe, to hold themſelves obliged to this writer, that he will not ſuſpect their zeal, though they write nothing againſt popery; that is their affair, not mine. It may not, however, be amiſs for them to profit by the ſneer of a back-friend: Not that, in my opinion, it would be much to their diſparagement, ſhould Gratus hereafter aſſert, that going to Cambridge, and going to Corinth are two different things. With reſpect to preſbyterial academies, it is certain, that the firſt public attack upon Pole's biographer, appeared in ſome ſpirited and very home ſtrictures in the Critical Review for the month of June, 1764. And if I am not greatly miſled by falſe information, the ingenious compiler of that article never ſtudied a ſingle hour in a Corinthian academy. Indeed, unleſs this be one inſtance, I cannot find that theſe academies have written much of late, either againſt popery, or the church of England (for ſuch of them as have appeared in your paper, Mr. Baldwin, are not in his account it ſeems to be ſtiled, Writers againſt popery) but then, the reaſon of their retenue, commonly aſſigned, is ſuch a one as would totally ruin the propriety of aſſimilating them to the Geeſe of the Capitol. The Geeſe of the Capitol had their *cibus e publico*, as a reward for their cackling, the others are ſaid to have it as a valuable conſideration for their not cackling. I am,

Newington, SIR, *Yours, &c.*

May 10. *No Traveller to Corinth.*

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 21, 1766.

ALETHES hath done very well to diſtinguiſh himſelf in Roman letters. Theſe are probably the letters in which he had read the controverſy between the Anglo-Roman church and the Diſſenters, and, not improbably, in one of thoſe reſpectable ſeminaries mentioned in the third and fourth columns of the firſt page of the ſame Chronicle wherein he figures. A. K. was therefore to blame to tax him with a total ignorance in that part of learning. He was only ignorant of thoſe controverſies as managed among proteſtants, who ſet out with certain common principles; namely, the ſufficiency of the ſcriptures in all points relating to ſalvation, and the ſupreme authority of thoſe ſacred writings to decide controverſies of faith. Of the iſſue of *ſuch* a controverſy, Alethes can have no conception. For he pretty openly confeſſes, that *his* God, and *his* Goſpel, are different from the God and the Goſpel of Cromwell. But nobody, I dare ſay, ever heard that Cromwell ever quoted any other goſpel beſides that revealed in the New Teſtament, or worſhipped any other God, but the one living and true God, the only object of worſhip ſet forth in thoſe ſacred oracles. Whereas the Roman hath Gods many, and Goddeſſes many, of whom Alethes may have his choice, and be directed in his worſhip of them by the goſ-

pel of Trent, and the goſpel-roſaries of many eminent ſaints and ſainteſſes too tedious to enumerate. In a word, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Alethes appears to be no other than one of thoſe underſtrappers to the reverend fathers the Jeſuits, who are at this time ſo laudably employed, under various ſignatures and diſguiſes, both in our news-papers and other writings, to widen the breach and foment the diſſenſion between the members of the proteſtant eſtabliſhed church of England, and the legally tolerated proteſtant diſſenters. But as, I hope, the wiſeſt and beſt of each of theſe are equally friends to the proteſtant ſettlement of the crown of Great Britain in the Houſe of Hanover, they will be equally careful not to be ſurprized, or irritated one againſt the other, by ſo ſtale and miſerable an artifice, to which their common enemy hath ſo often had recourſe.

I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

A GENTLEWOMAN.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 24, 1766.

IN peruſing the hiſtorical and critical account of the life of *Charles* II. written by Dr. *William Harris*, and lately publiſhed, I found (in vol. 2d. p. 105) a quotation from a charge of Bp. *Butler* to the clergy of the dioceſe of *Durham* in the year

1751

1751, wherein, *the edification to be reaped from the external forms of the Roman catholic religion*, is ſpoken of in terms, which would by no means ſound well from the mouth of a proteſtant Biſhop, not without ſomething very like an inſinuation, that *our reformers had reduced the form of religion to* too *great ſimplicity*. I had juſt before, read the article of Biſhop *Butler* in the laſt volume of the *Biographia Britannica*, (publiſhed much about the ſame time with Dr. *Harris*'s hiſtory) where not the leaſt notice is taken of this *charge*, though the compilers of that work ſet out with declaring, that, "They had "made it their ſtudy to repreſent the characters of "men of letters, *fairly* and *fully*, and to gratify "the reader with *correct* catalogues of their works." Hence I concluded Dr. *Harris* muſt have made ſome miſtake, and that he ſhould either have aſcribed this charge to *ſome* other Biſhop, or that it was a ſpurious compoſition, contrived to leſſen the character of this eminent Prelate. Recollecting however an old acquaintance, now in town, who had long reſided in the county of Durham, I immediately repaired to him for better information. My friend ſoon convinced me that Dr. *Harris* had made a faithful report, by ſhewing me the printed charge, and pointing out the very paſſage cited by the worthy hiſtorian of *Charles* II. But this was not all. My author aſſured me, this charge had given great offence, at the time of its publication, to many ſerious proteſtants, and that it had been ſeverely cenſured by a poor country curate in a ſpirited tract addreſſed to the Biſhop himſelf, intituled, *A ſerious enquiry into the uſe and importance of external religion*, printed for *Bladon*, 1752, wherein

wherein the ſaid curate has given it as the motive of his writing that letter, that "this very charge "had been ſtrenuouſly recommended by a zealous "and bigotted papiſt to a worthy proteſtant Gen- "tleman in his neighbourhood."

Theſe are curious particulars, Mr. Printer, and ſuch as the public had a right to know from ſuch undertakers as our *Biographi Britannici*, and the omiſſion of them muſt of courſe fix an imputation upon them, from which it will behove them to exculpate themſelves in the moſt explicit manner. It is not indeed, eaſy to conceive what they can have to ſay for this breach of faith towards the public. It will be in vain for them to alledge, that they neither knew, nor had the means of knowing theſe particulars. The reſpectable authorities they have cited in the margin of Biſhop *Butler*'s article for the reſt of their intelligence, muſt diſable at once all pretences of this ſort; not to mention, that, as I have been informed, both the *charge* and the *ſerious enquiry* were canvaſſed in the *Monthly Review*. There is one conſideration which above all others, renders their ſilence on this head highly blameable. They have taken great care to waſh Biſhop *Butler* clean from the *ſtinking* ſin of *preſbyterianiſm* (as one of your high-mettled correſpondents holds it to be) and have likewiſe vindicated the orthodoxy of his Lordſhip and one of his chaplains, at the expence of an eminent diſſenter, who (notwithſtanding their malevolent brand of *ſocinianiſm*) better deſerved a ſeparate article in a truly candid and impartial Biographical Dictionary, than many an inſignificant celebrated by them, for no other merit, in ſome caſes,

caſes, than his zealous conformity. But their doing this piece of juſtice to his Lordſhip's character, was but doing him juſtice by halves. In his Lordſhip's caſe, it was equally neceſſary to acquit him of all *penchant* towards the *other extreme*, to the reproach of which, this epiſcopal charge (to mention nothing elſe) had, as it now appears, expoſed him. And though I and ſome others, had it not been for Dr. *Harris*'s citation, might have gone to our graves in utter ignorance that ſuch a performance as this charge had ever ſeen the light, yet upon enquiry it appears, that Dr. *Butler*'s attachment to *external forms*, was no ſecret to the world, nor the *perverſe* interpretations that had been put upon it *after* this charge appeared. I deſire, Mr. Printer, to ſtand in this application to you, in no other light, than as an advocate for the public, which certainly hath a right to a fair and candid uſage in every book that is offered to its acceptance; but more eſpecially in ſo voluminous and expenſive a work as this of the *Biography*. To me it appears that the omiſſion in queſtion, could hardly be an involuntary error. But whatever the compilers of that work may have to offer in their own behalf, I dare ſay your Chronicle will be as open to them, as to me or any other man. I beg leave farther to declare, that I have that veneration for ſome part of Biſhop *Butler*'s character, that I ſhould be as unwilling to believe him to have had any tincture of the *ſpirit* of popery, as I am to believe it of other perſons in his ſtation; and I make no doubt but he may be as eaſily acquitted of it. In the mean time appearances are unfavourable; and the ſilence of his Biographical Hiſtorians upon a point of

of ſo great importance, does by no means contribute to allay the prejudice.

But after all, this omiſſion may be a ſign of *grace* in our compilers. It is poſſible their circumſtances and connections may be ſuch, as not to admit of their mentioning Biſhop *Butler*'s charge without ſome high encomium; and having made ſo free with the characters of Locke, Ruſſel, Sidney, and other champions of civil and religious liberty, and having at the ſame time, taken ſo much pains to *prop* and *whiten* ſome of the moſt determined enemies of it, till all the honeſt and moderate ſort of their readers began to be diſguſted with their partiality; they at length, bethought them of trying to recover a little credit with the juſtly-offended friends of true patriotiſm, by ſhewing them, on the occaſion of Biſhop Butler's article, that they could be aſhamed of SOMETHING.

I am,

SIR, *&c.*

NO STIFLER.

Fenchurch-ſtreet.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 27, 1766.

AS I am a member of the church of England, I cannot help being mortified when I meet with any thing (as I often do) to her diſadvantage in print. But though ſuch things diſturb me, my reaſon

reaſon and conſcience will not allow me to think, that moſt of them are not juſt and true; nay, I even think it undeniable, that if the church were to be reformed according to ſome hints thrown out by thoſe who are ſuppoſed to be none of her friends, ſhe would be, not only more defenſible upon the whole, but would come much nearer to the original idea of a truly chriſtian church. However, I am not half ſo much provoked at ſeeing her nakedneſs uncovered, in the eſſays above-mentioned, as to ſee her ſo miſerably defended by thoſe who undertake to anſwer them, and who ſeem to me to have no other arms (at leaſt to make uſe of no other) than the pointleſs and edgeleſs ones which have been ſo often battered and blunted in the ſervice of popery. Nothing, for example, can be more abſurd than to mix, as moſt of thoſe defenders do, the cauſe of the Stuarts, with the cauſe of the church of England. It may be affirmed, with great truth, that the church of England never had worſe enemies than the Princes of that family. The two firſt of them, under the pretence of taking her into their protection, made her appear in the eyes of all other proteſtant churches, as an abettor of almoſt as cruel perſecutions as were ever practiſed by the church of Rome, for which church, perhaps, both of them, at the bottom, had at leaſt as much reſpect, as for the church of England. It was owing to the Stuarts, that the church of England profeſſed and avowed the doctrine of the abſolute power of Kings, of unlimited paſſive obedience, and of the unpardonable ſin of reſiſtence; doctrines which, to her great ſhame and ſcandal, ſhe was obliged to recant, when the neceſſity of her affairs forced her

to

to look after her own preſervation; and when her freeborn ſons would otherwiſe have had no option before them, but either the abſolute deſtruction of their liberties, properties, and perſonal ſafety, or the guilt of *damnable* rebellion. Nothing need be ſaid of the friendſhip of the two ſucceeding Stuarts, Charles II. and James II. for the church of England, but that they were both papiſts, and made the church of England their dupe, in their attempts to ruin the proteſtant intereſt. With theſe facts and circumſtances in view, I own, that as a church-of-England-man, I can never think of theſe ſame Stuarts without horror and deteſtation, and cannot help pitying from my heart the weakneſs of my venerable, and, as it ſhould ſeem, ſuperannuated mother, that now, in her old age, and when ſhe is flouriſhing under the protection of a race of illuſtrious Princes, who have ever been ſo attentive to her *true* honour and intereſt, ſhe ſhould retain, among the reſt of her forms, two ſuch reproachful ſervices as thoſe for the 30th of January, and the 29th of May. Concerning the firſt of theſe, I ſhall ſay no more, after ſo much has been already ſaid on the ſubject, than that if I could *cordially* join in it, I could, with as little ſcruple of conſcience, ſay an *Ora pro nobis* upon my knees, before the picture of St. Charles the Martyr. The other ſervice, indeed, is not quite ſo indecent in its expreſſions, but is equally exceptionable on other accounts, as importing a moſt ſtrange inconſiſtency between the principles and the practice of the ſubjects of the preſent Royal Family on the Throne. I ſhall explain my meaning, Mr. Baldwin, by a little anecdote, which, I apprehend, may have eſcaped the

the notice of the major part of your readers. When, upon the reſtoration of King Charles II. this office of thankſgiving was firſt compoſed, the ſervice, upon the whole, was not unſuitable to the reaſonable ſentiments of thoſe, who thought monarchy preferable to the various fluctuating ſyſtems which had prevailed for ſome years before. The running title of the office then was, *The King's Birth and Return*. That, it ſeems, was preciſely the object of public thankſgiving. For though the Duke of York returned with the King, yet all the world knew he was a papiſt, and it was ſufficiently underſtood, by the compilers of the office, that the people of England would not think themſelves bound to thank God for the return of a Prince among them, whoſe religious and political principles were at utter enmity with their rights and liberties. On the other hand, it was not known that Charles was a papiſt as well as James, and there might be good hope that he would be a righteous King, and his reſtoration prove a bleſſing to his people. But upon King Charles's deceaſe, King James thought proper to have the ſervice altered, and public thanks given for the return of the *Royal Family*, as well as of the late King. And then likewiſe was the running title altered to *The Reſtoration of the Royal Family*. And thus both the ſervice and the title ſtand in our Common Prayer Books to this hour. Methinks it would not be an impertinent queſtion to aſk, what reaſon the good people of England can have in the year 1766, to give God thanks for the reſtoration of a King an hundred years ago, who, with his good will, would have delivered up our forefathers, bound hand and foot, to France, for the valuable con-

conſideration of a penſion—of a King, who by his profligate example, did all he could to corrupt the morals of his people—of a King, who occaſionally made a jeſt of all religion; who did what in him lay to ruin public credit at home and abroad, who baſely diſſembled the real principles of the religion he privately eſpouſed, and who having, under the maſk of a proteſtant, done all he durſt for the ſervice of popery for twenty-four years, died in the end a ſuperſtitious devotee to the idolatrous church of Rome? And, if theſe are not impertinent queſtions, which of our venerable paſtors will undertake to ſatisfy the man who ſhould aſk, what reaſon have the loyal ſubjects of King George III. to commemorate, by a ſolemn religious thankſgiving, the return of a bigotted popiſh Prince, whom our virtuous proteſtant anceſtors found it neceſſary to dethrone, for his acts of tyranny againſt the laws and liberties of this free country?—For the reſtoration of a Prince, whoſe poſterity, or, if you pleaſe, whoſe *Royal Family*, are for ever excluded from the government of theſe kingdoms, on account of their bearing, by principle, the ſame rancorous malice to the public liberty of Great Britain, that their ill-ſtarred father did? What a delicious contraſt is this to our thankſgivings for the Revolution, on the fifth of November, and for the ſucceſſive commemorations of the Acceſſion of three gracious and good Princes of the Houſe of Hanover, fathers of their people, and faſt friends to, and protectors of, the civil and religious liberties of this happy country. Does our liturgic ſervice want no reformation in this article? Can an abſurd inconſiſtency like this be defended, or varniſhed, by the moſt dex-

dextrous clerical quibbler of the eſtabliſhment? No—I chooſe not to ſay what I think upon the occaſion, in terms which ſo ſtrange a ſoleciſm, both in religion and politics, calls for. Let facts ſpeak for themſelves. Whence have we had, within theſe very few years, ſo much more attention paid to the 29th of May, than for ſeveral years before? Whence ſo much gilded oak worn on that feſtival for two years by-paſt, with inſcriptions plainly pointing the wiſhes of the wearer to another reſtoration? If theſe things are authoriſed, or encouraged, by the real principles of the epiſcopal church of England, I care not if I turn preſbyterian to-morrow, nor ſhould I be ſorry, if every proteſtant in Great Britain would follow my example. But I truſt, matters are not yet come to that paſs. Had this letter appeared in your Chronicle the laſt year about this time, I could not have anſwered for what might have happened to you for printing it, or to me for writing it. But we have now the ſatisfaction of being quite ſafe under an adminiſtration, who have as warm hearts towards the welfare of our proteſtant government, as either of us; and from whom every loyal ſubject of our gracious and amiable King, has not only nothing to fear for publiſhing memorials of this kind, but much to hope, that due attention will be paid to them, and proper meaſures taken, in due time, (whoever may oppoſe them) to deliver our church and conſtitution from the reproach of ſo glaring and opprobrious an incongruity. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

The Country Curate of January the Firſt.

To

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 29, 1766.

ONE ſtory is good till another is told. Mr. Moderato's long tale in your Chronicle of Saturday laſt is all wrong. And I will tell you all how and about it. Lord, Sir, it is no ſuch thing as a farmer he means, and I am that very ſame Betty that he pretends he made the ſpeech to. Well, Sir, this Mr. Moderato pretended he had got the ſtewardſhip, though he never would ſhew any of us his commiſſion; and the firſt thing he did was to tell us all, that my old maſter's written directions for the government of the family were not ſufficient, and that we muſt all ſign ſome articles that he pulled out of his pocket. I forget many of them, but one I remember was, that we muſt wear ſhirts and ſmocks above our clothes as well as under them. Lord, thought I, what a ſtrange man is this! Well, Sir, ſome ſigned theſe new articles; others would not; and thoſe who refuſed, he pulled by the ear, tweaked their noſes, and kicked their ſhins till they were black and blue. If they ran away, he followed them about the houſe, till he found them, and if they proved too hard for him at talking againſt his articles, away ran he for the conſtable, and ordered them to be carried to the juſtice, from thence ſome to the ſtocks, ſome to the whipping poſt, and ſome he branded with old Peter Stumpcroſs's marking iron.

iron. Indeed, Sir, the whole houſe was like Bedlam, and he foaming and raging with the articles in one hand, a horſe-whip in the other, and a pen and ink in his button-hole, crying, "Sign, ſign, "or I'll trim you." At times he had the ſtrangeſt freaks imaginable. The ſtory of the tale he hints at is truly this. One night he would needs thruſt the ſide of the long table up cloſe to the wall, and when ſupper was ready, would not let a ſoul of us ſit down, as my old maſter uſed to do with his family; but declared, that not one of us ſhould have a mouthful, unleſs we would kneel down, and let him put it into our mouths. At other times we were not to have a bite till we made a bow to the table under the window. Sometimes he would take a fancy that we ſhould not ſay our prayers but as he directed, and then he told us, that we were to kneel with our faces all one way, and have a fidler playing to us. And what was the beſt of it, he called all theſe *indifferent things*, at the ſame time that he clenched his fiſt, and threatened every mother's ſon and daughter of us with the pillory, if we did not comply. Thoſe poor creatures, who were willing to ſign his articles, and do as he did, got good pickings, but the duce a crumb was there for any of us that diſobeyed him, and would not. One morning he would needs drive us all into a park, but you have told that ſtory already, Mr. Baldwin, wherever you got it, exactly as it fell out, and ſo I will ſay no more of it. Well, after living a dog's life with this whimſical ſteward, honeſt John and I agreed that we would be married: But he ſaid we ſhould not unleſs John would buy me a gold ring, and pro-

promiſe to ſtoop down and kiſs my ſhoe-ſtring. Poor John, Mr. Baldwin, was in love, and ſo he agreed, and ſo a'nt pleaſe you he is my huſband. But Mr. Moderator was ready to ſwear, that without this ring, and this circumſtance of the ſhoe-ſtring, we ſhould have been no better than rogue and whore. Well, Sir, not to tire you, this was the life we led for ſeveral years, till a good-natured juſtice came into the neighbourhood, who would give no ear to Mr. Moderato's frivolous complaints, and would not ſuffer a ſingle ſoul of us to be ſet in the ſtocks any more, and gave leave to ſuch of us as would not eat our ſuppers, or ſay our prayers in Mr. Moderato's new-fangled way, to go to eat and pray in another houſe. And ever ſince that, we have lived comfortably, and followed our old maſter's written directions as well as we could, and gave ourſelves no concern about Moderato's articles, whom, indeed, we now very ſeldom ſee. The other day, however, I met him by chance, made him a curtſie, and aſked his Honour how he did. Oh! Bet, ſays he, is that thee? How does John do? What doſt think Bet? Why, thou jade, I am going Steward to America, where I hope to find the family more tractable about indifferent things than you peeviſh ſcrubs were in the old manour houſe. A good journey to your Honour; but pray your Honour, when do you ſet forward? Why, as ſoon as ever I can get my deputation from the juſtice's hand, and * * * * *. He was walking off in the midſt of this laſt ſentence, and I could not catch the end of it. But, however, Mr. Baldwin, I have heard a bird ſing, that the American family will no more like Mr. Mo-

Moderato's company than we did in the old manour houſe. But that is none of my buſineſs, which was only to ſet you and your readers right in this affair, which this artful man had ſo much miſrepreſented; and am, with my own, and honeſt John's compliments,

Your humble ſervant,

ELIZ. VERITY.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *May* 31, 1766.

TO give your readers a juſt idea of the diſpute between *Gratus* and the *No Traveller to Corinth*, it will be neceſſary to obſerve, that the four learned Gentlemen, who have animadverted on Phillips's Life of Cardinal Pole, were not brought into the debate by the latter. And as ſoon as they were mentioned by *Gratus*, all poſſible reſpect was paid to their merit by me, and nothing queſtioned relating either to their *willingneſs* or their *abilities* to combat the Roman catholics, but whether they could be ſaid to derive either of them from Oxford. For my own part, I ſhould have been very willing to leave that part of the queſtion relating to their abilities, *ſub judice*, but muſt freely confeſs I am not yet diſpoſed to think that they owe their *willingneſs* to engage in the controverſy to any influence from that quarter. But ſince he hath introduced them a *ſecond time*, it belongs to my own juſtification, to refer him to their ſeveral articles in

the Critical Review, where, perhaps, he may not find ſo much aſcribed to the abilities of ſome of them at leaſt, as I was right ready to allow. I have heard it likewiſe obſerved by others, that ſome of theſe writers ſeemed more ſolicitous to defend the church of England againſt the principles and objections of the papiſts, than the proteſtant religion at large. This ſolicitude, indeed, they are likely enough to have brought from Oxford. But as the great Chillingworth, in purſuing his victory over his jeſuitical adverſary, found it neceſſary frankly to diſclaim the defence of any part of any particular ſyſtem, which was not immediately founded upon the Bible, I cannot but think there muſt be ſome want of penetration into the nature of the ſubject, where the oppoſers of popery regulate their anſwers and defences with a particular view to the tenets of ſome particular body of nominal proteſtants, and more eſpecially, where any conſiderable parts of the creed, confeſſion, or ritual of ſuch body, have little or nothing to ſupport them but mere human authority. If this obſervation ſhould happen to affect any part of the anſwers given by theſe learned and worthy writers to Father Phillips's performance, it will give me concern. But I hope they will remember, that they were not brought upon the carpet by me, but by their pretended friend *Gratus*, who hath managed his matters, as if he was deſirous of ſetting ſomebody a tilting at them.

With reſpect to *Gratus*'s quotations from *Miſomumpſimus*, a ſhort explanation will ſerve to ſet that matter right. A want of abilities in the *parochial* clergy, does not imply any want of abilities in

in the governing part of our univerſities, who ought to have inſtructed them better, or in thoſe whoſe province it is to examine into their fitneſs for diſcharging their clerical functions; and every reader of *Miſomumpſimus*'s letter (of common candour, I will not ſay, but) of common ſenſe will obſerve, that a want of *willingneſs* to oppoſe popery is aſcribed, not to the parochial clergy, but to their ſuperiors *alone*, in the ſeveral departments there mentioned. So that after all, a little of the critic's aid, to quibble *Gratus* out of this *miſrepreſentation*, is not to be deſpiſed.

Nothing could be more prudent in *Gratus*, than his ſilence with regard to certain queries in my laſt letter. But that he ſhould not ſtay to anſwer the queſtions he cites from *Miſomumpſimus*'s letter, was both prudent, and ſingularly fortunate for him. He ſtood, indeed, at that inſtant, upon the brink of a precipice without being aware of his danger. Had the temptation taken him to anſwer thoſe queſtions, it is but too probable, that *one* letter from *A young clergyman of Cambridge* in the ſame Chronicle with his own, June 19, and *another*, from *An Oxford Speculator*, in the Public Advertiſer the day before, would have reduced him to the neceſſity of having recourſe once more to the criticks for a commodious ſolution of his paradoxes.

I muſt confeſs I am one of thoſe who do not ſtand much in awe of the infection of any ſort of fanaticiſm, the fanaticiſm of the church of Rome excepted. But for the reſt, I moſt cordially join in *Gratus*'s good wiſhes, that proteſtant churchmen and proteſtant diſſenters would unite in ſtrenuous

endeavours to check the daring advances of popery. But let him truſt me for once, when I tell him, That they cannot poſſibly join hand and heart in this neceſſary work, till each party, laying aſide the *peculiarities* of their reſpective ſyſtems, ſhall agree to make their common attacks upon the genuine principles of the proteſtant reformation, in other words of true chriſtian liberty. Which, if they could be prevailed with to do on either ſide, I would venture to foretel, that the downfal of popery, in Great Britain, could be at no great diſtance. I am, SIR,

Yours, &c.

No Traveller to Corinth.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *June* 19, 1766.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

A Writer who calls himſelf *A Friend to Truth*, in your Chronicle of June 3, appears to be extremely nettled at an excellent and ſeaſonable letter publiſhed in your paper a while ago, giving an account of the popiſh ſeminaries along the coaſts of France and Flanders*. But may we not aſk, What is his quarrel with the author of that narrative? Does he, as a friend to truth, deny the facts related in that letter! By no means. He only tells

* This letter appeared firſt in the St. James's Chronicle, May 13, 1766.

tells us, that "every one knows them *ſufficiently*, "who has but a tolerable acquaintance with the "affairs of the continent." But how few are *theſe*, in compariſon of others who are *not* ſufficiently acquainted with the affairs of the continent, to know, that a race of men and women are breeding up in theſe pernicious ſeminaries, in principles at utter enmity with the civil and religious liberty of this country, whither they are to return, and to fill ſtations where they will have but too many opportunities of corrupting the minds of their fellow-citizens, and ſome of them perhaps of doing ſtill farther miſchief. In the mean time let not this pretended *Friend to Truth* imagine that the people of this happy iſland will allow him and his clan to eſtimate their *bleſſedneſs* for them. It is well known that they were far from being ſatisfied with the *paſtoral care* of the late adminiſtration. They were indeed heartily tired of them, and were juſtly jealous that they were promoting ſomething juſt the reverſe of the natural and genuine fruit of the *glorious revolution*. And it now appears (from the intelligence given us by this *naughty* traveller) that there was, in this matter, a moſt remarkable coincidence in the ſentiments of his Majeſty's *well-affected* ſubjects on *this* ſide the water, and of the *diſaffected* on *the other*. This is a galling truth to our intruding critic, the diſcovery of which gives him, no doubt, the utmoſt pain, and ſufficiently accounts for his awkward and impertinent ridicule thrown out againſt the letter-writer, to whoſe veracity on this head, he cannot form the leaſt objection. And the credit of the hiſtorian being eſtabliſhed, what is it to thoſe who are concerned to

remark theſe *intereſting* facts, in what capacity, or with what views the perſon travels who relates them?

If the bank and the reſt of our public funds, had occaſion for the money of the enemies of our conſtitution to ſupport public credit, it was but a *curſt neceſſity* (as Shakeſpear calls it) which moſt probably, *the Gentlemen who compoſed the adminiſtration* of that æra, brought upon themſelves. But if the ſame neceſſity ſtill continues, I freely own, it would give me the utmoſt concern; as it is not yet forgot by ſome of us, what effects a run upon the bank was like to have had in the memorable year 1745, or who were the *well-affected* contrivers of it.

Theſe conſiderations remind us of the young Pretender, and will ſerve to introduce a few remarks on the elogium of that magnanimous hero, exhibited by this *Friend to Truth*. And the firſt which occurs is, that one and the ſame panegyriſt ſhould take under his protection, in one and the ſame pleading, this unfortunate adventurer, and the *honourable* Gentlemen who compoſed the late adminiſtration. Surely this *Friend to Truth*, cannot be *Anti-Sejanus* himſelf in a ſtate of penitence? But let every man form his own conjecture, while our worthy traveller enjoys his own juſtification from the pen of the very man, who ſo weakly attempts to diſcredit him.

The traveller had ſaid, that "the young Pretender was privately viſited by ſeveral perſons from "England, in the ſummers 1764 and 1765." What ſays the *Friend to Truth* to this? Why he does not believe it; but however will not venture to

to contradict it. Hitherto then, we are ſtill ſafe as to matters of fact.

But he *will* venture to deny that his hero is *puſillanimous*, and even undertakes to prove the contrary. Firſt by referring us to the battles of *Preſton Pans* and *Falkirk*. But in the former of theſe engagements, the Adventurer's valour met with ſo little reſiſtance, that he could hardly exerciſe it, except in ſome inhuman acts of wanton cruelty upon a few ſtraggling and deſerted fugitives, among whom (if it is any honour to him) he is indeed ſaid to have done *ſome* execution. Of his exploits at *Falkirk*, hiſtory is ſilent, ſave only that it records him to have been *in the rear, almoſt oppoſite to the centre, but more inclining to the right;* which was likewiſe his ſtation at *Culloden*, as this *Friend to Truth* is ſo far from denying, that he apologizes for his being ſtationed at ſo ſafe a diſtance.

Oh! but to queſtion the young Pretender's courage, is to detract from the merit of the Duke of Cumberland's victory. Hardly that I believe. For whatever their General did, the highlanders fought in good earneſt; no one ever queſtioned *their* valour, or ever thought they wanted the young Pretender's ſpirit to give them courage upon that or any other occaſion: nor was the rebel army on that memorable day, by any means ſo deſpicable as this ſhameleſs writer affects to repreſent it.

His laſt reſort is to the public teſtimonies of the Pretender's courage to be found in the *Gazettes* of that time, and in the hiſtories of *Voltaire* and *S———t*. He muſt mean the Gazettes of *Paris* and *Edinburgh*, for in no others can any material

account of his courage be found. For the reſt, he would do well to reconcile *Voltaire* and *S——t* on the ſubject of the Pretender's exploits, before he attempts to avail himſelf of their joint-teſtimony. But to be as liberal to him as we can afford, we will allow the *complete hiſtorian* of our own iſland to be the more credible witneſs of the two. Now I would fain know upon what foundation, our *Friend to Truth* would eſtabliſh the veracity of *this* hiſtorian. If *The Friend to Truth* has read *S——t*'s account of the tranſactions at *Culloden*, he has but little reaſon to believe that the hiſtorian's view was to do honour, or even common juſtice to the Duke of Cumberland, as a late hiſtory of that illuſtrious Prince has made appear to the ſatisfaction of every unprejudiced reader. What ſecurity then can we have for the veracity of ſuch a writer? Unleſs perhaps our *Friend to Truth*, will appeal to a certain penſion, conferred (as is likely enough, when we conſider times and circumſtances) for the Dr's *hiſtorical* ſervices; where, to be ſure, his affection for the glorious revolution, and for what this Gentleman calls the *fruit* and *conſequence* of it, ſhines out with uncommon luſtre.

But the pleaſantry of it is, that our *Friend to Truth* ſhould bring the farce played by the young Pretender in France, as an inſtance of his *courage*. A farce, which ſome of his wiſer and more intelligent friends have called a clumſy piece of amuſement, that impoſed upon no body but a few of the meaner catholics and numb-ſcull'd jacobites, who were glad of any thing to keep up their ſpirits, at that mortifying ſeaſon.

Upon the whole, I am of opinion with many

others, that the hero of this *Friend to Truth* is highly obliged to our honeſt and impartial traveller, for diveſting him of the hitherto current characters of a ſot and a madman, and giving him in exchange the more innocent and leſs miſchievous qualities of cowardice, and ſuperſtitious bigotry, the latter of which, our *Friend to Truth*, if I miſtake not his complexion, eſteems a ſubject of praiſe, rather than of reproach. I am,

Yours, &c.

PHILODITES.

ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE, *June* 24, 1760.

To the PRINTER.

The church (God bleſs it) *has but a poor pittance.*
Political Debates.

SIR,

I Have obſerved in ſeveral of the public prints, an extract from certain *Free and* (as they are miſcalled) *candid Remarks on a late celebrated Oration*, meaning the ſpeech of our illuſtrious patriot on a late memorable occaſion, when both the Britiſh and American ſubject had too much at ſtake to be inattentive to the efforts either of their friends or enemies in the courſe of that important debate. Thanks to the operations of common ſenſe, and the evidence of undeniable facts, inforced by the powerful eloquence of the great commoner, the

pernicious measure was annihilated with universal approbation, which will hardly be diminished by the *ex post facto* cavils of an ecclesiastical quill-driver, who has forgot the elements of grammar, if ever he learned them. I call this Remarker an ecclesiastic, as he opens the particulars of his case with a reference to the motto of my paper, which brings him within *my* province, and affords me a most seasonable, but very unexpected opportunity of resuming my speculations on the accumulating revenues of the church.

From this incidental hint in Mr. P—'s speech, our frothy critic begins his tragedy, and with the woeful grimace of a galled hypocrite, "laments "the sadness of the times, when such breaches of "decency and decorum are suffered in a solemn "assembly of the nation, and in a full and solemn "debate;" not without an insinuation, that "if "such an instance of licentiousness had escaped a "man of inferior rank, he would have had the "curb of the civil magistrate upon his jaws;" a menace, however, which I cannot but hope, for my own sake, is a little premature.

He calls it, "a ridicule of the members of that "religion, which has ever been considered, by the "wisdom of our forefathers, as the most actuating "influence on the morals of the *inferior* class of "mankind." Nonsense, generally speaking, is neither true nor false. One may, however, pick out of this specimen of it, two propositions, to one of which some good christians will probably demurr; and I dare say the church will hardly thank him for his untimely hinting at the other. 1. He would have you conceive, that the influence of

of the eſtabliſhed church, and the influence of the chriſtian religion, is one and the ſame; and in conſequence, that the pittances of the church ſhould be as ſafe from ridicule, as the precepts of the goſpel. But then, 2. All this is quite ſpoiled by the other propoſition, which implies, that the actuating influence of religion is calculated for the morals of the *inferior claſs of mankind*. Which is probably enough true of the influence of the church eſtabliſhed; but will by no means ſuit the influence of the chriſtian religion, which was undoubtedly calculated to reach the morals of all claſſes of mankind. And indeed nothing could be more unlucky than our author's appeal, on this occaſion, to the wiſdom of our foreſathers, many of whom had juſt the ſame idea of the influence of popery, that the Remarker appears to entertain of the influence of the eſtabliſhed church.

But to come at length to my motto. I have been informed, that no part of Mr. P—'s inimitable ſpeech gave greater pleaſure to the friends of religious and civil liberty, than this curſory hint concerning the landed property of the church. A ſecret joy was obſerved to enliven the countenances of many of his reſpectable audience, who were ſenſible how proper ſubjects of p—l—m—ry deliberation, the ſtate and application of church revenues had been for the laſt half century. The great commoner's language, was not only admiſſible (in the Remarker's phraſe) but had been actually admitted into many private companies, and unanimouſly judged to be the language of true patriotiſm, and expreſſive of the cordial ſentiments of every one who wiſhed to ſee the proſperity of this free proteſtant country eſtabliſhed

upon the moſt ſolid and laſting baſis. On theſe occaſions, it has been obſerved, that there is a large landed property ſettled upon the church in perpetuity; an encreaſing, accumulating property, under the notion of promoting true religion, but which, in ſome inſtances of its application, hath the appearance of obſtructing it, and, in others, hath had the actual effect of bringing ſcandal upon it; not to mention an increaſe of political power, thrown, by the means of this property, into the hands of a ſort of men, who have often been known to make a moſt miſchievous uſe of it. It is viſible that the largeſt portions of this immenſe eſtate fall to the ſhare of thoſe who neither do nor can do, a tenth part of the buſineſs, for which the emoluments they enjoy were at firſt appropriated; and that the ſubſtantial work of religion is performed chiefly by others, who have reaſon to think themſelves happily dealt with if their wages exceed, by one third, the ſalaries which commendams and pluralities enable their ſuperiors to allow their coachmen and butlers. Still theſe are but the reflexions of private parties, and make no impreſſions upon thoſe whom they principally concern. Opulence in a coach and ſix, and under the protection of a legal eſtabliſhment, will laugh at the diſeſteem and cenſure of individuals, though of the beſt ſenſe, and the moſt unexceptionable characters. In the mean time, the language of my motto, had never been heard, perhaps for more than a century, in that publick company, where alone it could be heard to any good publick purpoſe. At length the great commoner (born to be a bleſſing to his King and country) hath broke the ice, and we will hope, diſſolved the ſpell, which, by ſome un-

unaccountable faſcination, has been laid upon the tongues of men of the beſt ſenſe, the trueſt judgement, and the moſt unſuſpected affection for their country, and who did not want to be convinced, that this is a ſubject on which they ought to have broke ſilence long ago. The firſt ſurprize is now over. The propriety of the language is now acknowledged on all hands. And there is little doubt, but it will become, in due time as familiar to the ears of a certain publick company, as it is, and has been, in almoſt every private one.

The Remarker's *lay*-politicks, I paſs by, as out of my range. The truth ſeems to be, that they are only calculated to cover the bitterneſs of his eccleſiaſtical reſentment. For the reſt they are probably by this time conſigned to the grocer, never more to be heard of, unleſs perhaps in ſome critical catalogue, where, indeed, they may have one more chance to figure along with ſome other varniſhings of the Gentle Shepherd, *or* THE *Man of* THE *Country*. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

PLEBEIUS

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *June* 28, 1766.

I Have often wiſhed that thoſe Gentlemen, who are ſo very angry with the advocates of religious and civil liberty, and who ſo frequently vent their

their ſpleen in your Chronicle, and other periodical papers, would favour their opponents ſo far as to mark their ſeveral performances with ſome ſymbolic character, by which we might diſtinguiſh to what religious communion they belong, as clearly as we diſcover, by internal tokens, *what manner of ſpirit they are of*. The jeſuits, and as I think, moſt of the popiſh clergy, mark the letters they write to each other, or to their devotees, with a certain number of croſſes, or ſome other ſignificant emblems, by which the correſpondent certainly knows the *ſtock* of the writer, whatever may be contained in the body of the epiſtle. For want of ſome ſuch criterion, it is common to find in the weekly and daily papers, ſome high churchman of the eſtabliſhment, complaining of a broken head from a whig or a fanatic, when the ſtroke was evidently aimed at a popiſh prieſt. On the other hand, we have known a venerable father of ſome catholic order, attempt with great zeal and gravity to defend the holy Roman church, from an imputation, which was meant for the reproof of ſome red-hot bigot of our own eſtabliſhment.

Theſe reflections are ſuggeſted at this time, by a letter ſigned *Moderato* in your Chronicle of June 3, which gives exactly the ſame account of *moderation*, *toleration*, *perſecution*, *tyranny*, *liberty*, and *popery*, that an Inquiſitor General might do, without ſcandalizing the proceedings of the holy office, or himſelf for preſiding in it. And yet, in the end of the ſame letter, there is an inſinuation as if the writer were a member of ſome church, which is of all others, the greateſt terror to popery. If one ſhould anſwer him, and obſerve, that the proteſtant

teſtant church of England could not be more eſſentially injured, than by palming upon her theſe equivocal definitions, it is an hundred to one but he would give you to underſtand, by ſome indirect *innuendo*, that the honour of the proteſtant church of England was the leaſt of all his cares, and that he leaves her to the patronage of thoſe whom it may concern to defend her. Should we take this oblique hint, and conclude from it that he had gone through his courſes of divinity and politics at Liege, Bruges, or St. Omer's, he would not fail, in the next exhibition of himſelf, to exclaim with open throat againſt this miſrepreſentation, declare his averſion to the apocalyptic whore, and his profound reverence for the mitre of the epiſcopal church of England.

We are preciſely under the ſame dilemma with reſpect to the writings of Meſſieurs *Orthodoxus*, *The Glouceſterſhire Curate*, *Irritabilis*, *Cato*, *Gratus*, *Barebones*, and twenty more, who figure on the ſide of intolerance in the church, and deſpotiſm in the ſtate. And what can we do, Mr. Baldwin? Nothing can be more deſtructive of public liberty, nothing more inauſpicious to the natural and legal rights of free Britons, than the principles theſe men eſpouſe, and the diſpoſitions they diſcover in maintaining them. Nothing more evident than that they hold theſe principles, and indulge theſe diſpoſitions in common with the moſt rancorous papiſts. An inviolable attachment to an enormous number of ritual and ceremonial ſuperſtitions; a profound veneration for the fathers who preſcribe them, not only without authority from, but againſt the ſenſe of Chriſt and his apoſtles; an enthuſiaſtic affec-

affection for the popiſh family of the Stuarts, and an obſtinate adherence to all the nonſenſe of divine right, and paſſive obedience, calculated to gloſs over and excuſe the cruelties and oppreſſions of that infatuated race; an unlimited exaltation of church authority; and an irreconcileable ſpite and malignity towards all diſſenters from eſtabliſhed ſyſtems; theſe have ever been among the moſt inconteſtable and plain proofs of a popiſh enmity to all the ſalutary coercions of civil and eccleſiaſtical tyranny, with which we were bleſſed at the revolution. And where, I would deſire to know, ſhall we look for thoſe diſtinctions in the writings of theſe men, which can reaſonably intitle them to a place in a different claſs?

It is true, they ſometimes run foul of each other; but ſtill without diſconcerting their common plan, as it lately happened in the caſe of the two *Moderates*, when one of them found it neceſſary to diſown the other; though it was evident, that, like the two Soſias, they were both upon the ſame errand; and I defy the moſt ſagacious critic in Great Britain, who has read their letters, to decide, to which of the two we are indebted for this curious ſpecimen of a new *Dictionnaire Philoſophique*. And yet, ſome people will have it that they are of two different communions.

On ſome occaſions, in order to humble the whigs and fanatics, and give themſelves conſequence with the Bridewell boys and others of that ſtamp, they inſinuate their connexions with the great and the powerful. Thus the jocular *Praiſe-God Barebones*, among his other aſinine gambols, takes occaſion to compliment the favourite with

his

his gracious patronage; on the preſumption, I ſuppoſe, that the good people of England will pay a particular reſpect to writings, which are dedicated to the defence and exculpation of ſo popular and beloved a patriot. And in his ſecond letter, which he either would not venture with you, Mr. Baldwin, or which you, perhaps, very prudently declined to publiſh, he makes honourable or rather diſhonourable mention of *the favourite*, *the tories*, and the *court party* as joint partizans in his cauſe, the plain drift of which is to ſtigmatize the proteſtant diſſenters with every odious and immoral imputation, to white-waſh the papiſts, and to keep up an idolatrous veneration for the abdicated family, with a view, no doubt, to a ſecond adventure in the Highlands, or perhaps nearer home.

For the favourite and the tories, we have little to ſay. *Barebones* may know more of them than we do. But the *court party*, muſt, of courſe, include the preſent adminiſtration, who have hitherto paſſed for friends of public liberty, and unſuſpected, as far as I know, of entering into ſuch alliances.

But, *Fas eſt et ab hoſte doceri*. If they have been too inattentive to the increaſing ſtrength and inſolence of popery, and thereby given encouragement to anti-revolution maxims and doctrines, which always riſe and fall with it: If they have been unadviſedly drawn into the vortex of favouritiſm, and by that baneful influence have ſlipped the precious opportunity of fixing themſelves in the confidence of the people beyond the power of oppoſition: And if by theſe or any other appearances, they have given real occaſion to the triumph of this wicked ſcribbler and his abettors; their friends will have

reaſon

reaſon to lament their inſtability in both ſenſes of the term. The body of the people have not yet ſo far loſt their diſcernment or their feeling as to be inſenſible on what baſis their liberties and welfare will always be eſtabliſhed with the greateſt ſecurity. If they find themſelves miſtaken in the men with whom they ſo lately and ſo willingly intruſted this valuable depoſit, their former anxieties will return, and they will begin to look for better things, from more ſteady, conſiſtent, and diſintereſted patriots; nor will they be long in finding them, as their experience will direct them to one or two, perhaps to a third * more lately diſcovered, whom neither the overbearing influence of an ambitious favourite could ever intimidate, or the allurement of honours and emoluments could ever prevail with to deſert the true intereſt of an amiable king, as it ſtands connected with that of a ſenſible and generous people. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

An Unchangeable Whig.

LONDON CHRONICLE, *July* 3, 1766.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *Cambridge, June* 24.

AMONG other articles of news in the public prints, we were lately informed, that "on "Sun-

* All three have ſince been weighed in the balance, and found wanting.

" Sunday the eighth inſtant, a Romiſh prieſt read " his recantation of the errors of that church, and " his aſſent to the doctrines of the church of Eng- " land, at the pariſh church of St. Ethelburga in " Biſhopſgate-ſtreet, before a numerous audience." I could not help reflecting, on reading this paragraph, that if Mr. B——r, the hiſtorian of the Popes, had taken this public method of renouncing the errors of the Romiſh religion, when he firſt profeſſed himſelf a proteſtant, he would have eſcaped much of the mortification he hath met with from his implacable adverſaries. In that caſe he would, it is likely, have put himſelf out of the temptation of trafficking with the Jeſuits, even in money matters. His duplicity with reſpect to the two religions (if that was the caſe) would have been leſs practicable. And, if he was ſincere, he would have had a public and notorious fact to appeal to, againſt which, the ſort of evidence produced by the Jeſuits and their dependants, even dreſſed up as it is with all the artifice and vehemence of the paſſionate and wordy *Detector*, would have made much leſs impreſſion. At any rate, the cauſe would have been brought to a ſhorter iſſue by ſuch a public ſtep, and matters would not have been left under that ſuſpenſe with reſpect to Mr. B.'s true character, in which they are now likely to remain.

For my own part, I freely confeſs I am inclined to think more favourably of Mr. B. than ſome others, to whoſe judgment I ſhould be very ready to ſubmit in other matters. I will not ſay that he hath abſolutely acquitted himſelf of the ſuſpicion of writing the *ſeven* letters; but prejudice itſelf, qua-

qualified with the loweſt degree of candor, muſt allow, that he hath fixed upon his accuſers a good deal of calumny in *other* articles, and how far ſoever he may have been really guilty of acting a double part, he hath made it ſufficiently appear that his antagoniſts, who call themſelves proteſtants, are intituled to no great praiſe, for engaging ſo deeply in the dirty work of the Jeſuits, and making themſelves anſwerable for the credit and integrity of ſo many individuals of that order. In theſe reflexions, I think myſelf well juſtified by the printed evidence of Mr. *Arnold*, which, if it had been authenticated by the uſual ſolemnities before a magiſtrate, (and that it was not, is moſt unaccountable) would have afforded as juſt an occaſion to our government of expelling that pernicious fraternity, and all their retainers, as either the French or Portugueſe could alledge for ſo wiſe and ſo neceſſary a meaſure.

But however it is not for the ſake of Mr. B. that I entered into this detail, and I muſt now come back to this more ingenuous convert who hath ſo lately borne his public teſtimony againſt the errors of popery. I cannot but wiſh he may be encouraged and enabled by ſome handſome proviſion, to be farther ſerviceable to the proteſtant cauſe. Of this Gentleman's former ſituation and connexions in the world, or whether he is a native of Britain, or a foreigner, the public papers do not inform us. His motives, I truſt, are motives of conſcience, and if thro' an honeſt conviction of what he believes to be the truth, he hath given up a certain, though a ſcanty maintenance, it will be a reflection upon us to whom he is come over, to

leave

leave him with no better rewards of his ſincerity than neglect and indigence, as I fear hath been the lot of ſome others in his ſituation, in times paſt. I have heard of ſome very reproachful inſtances of this, and of one in particular the laſt winter :—An unhappy foreigner, who though he came over, with very full credentials of his ſincerity, and ample atteſtations of his moral character, had the diſcomfort to meet with a very cold reception, where he expected to find the higheſt encouragement. I forbear to enter into any farther particulars of his hiſtory, than juſt to ſay, that the laſt account of him left it uncertain, whether he was ſtarving in ſome obſcure corner, to keep out of a worſe kind of impriſonment for ſome debts he had contracted; or whether he hath found it more eligible to ſeek his bread in ſome more hoſpitable proteſtant country. Surely this neglect of converts from popery, can hardly be reconciled with a proper attention to the welfare of this proteſtant iſland. I have been informed by Gentlemen who have travelled for better purpoſes than to pick up French or Italian manners, that they have met with many honeſt and ſenſible men in the cloiſters abroad, who frankly declared their ſtrong inclination to renounce their popiſh errors, and to betake themſelves to this land of liberty, were it not for the fear of wanting common ſubſiſtence, and of being deſerted on all hands, as had been the fate of ſome of their friends who had made the experiment. In my poor opinion, we could not give a more ſtriking inſtance of our national charity, (to ſay nothing of our national policy) than in providing and endowing ſome proper and comfortable aſylum for ſuch con-

converted refugees as are inclined to take ſanctuary with us, upon a full conviction of the errors of popery, at leaſt till ſome employment for their reſpective talents might be found, in which they might be enabled to provide in ſome decent and creditable way for their own maintenance.

It is not to be told what advantages might be derived upon the public, by ſuch an inſtitution, under a prudent and circumſpect management. If one conſiders how many men are ſupported in this kingdom by plentiful revenues, appropriated to nothing that is viſible about them, but their habit and their denomination, one would imagine that part of the bread they eat might be ſpared for the ſuſtenance of others who would earn it by one ſort of more uſeful ſervice at leaſt, the weakning the hands of our inveterate and irreconcileable enemy. I will not diſſemble that I have here in my eye, among others, certain inhabitants of the places from whence I date this letter. We have among us (and I am told, the ſame ſort of beings may be found among our couſins to the ſouth weſt of us) men who might live upon half the meat and drink they conſume, and be in no worſe plight for exerciſing their intellectual faculties in ſome uſeful ſtudy.—And yet I do not know but I may be too late with my project: For it is rumoured that theſe *Fainéants*, conſcious, as it ſhould ſeem, that they have nothing to ſhew for their luxurious keeping, but a graceful double chin, a fair round paunch, and perhaps a tune or two on the fiddle, are thinking to make the public ſome amends for their former loſs of time, in the way of *population*. And as in that caſe, they will have wives and chil-

children to partake of their dainties; it would be abſurd to abridge them of the *means* of doing that particular kind of good in their generation. Let us ſee then if we cannot find a ſuccedaneum, without encroaching on their peculiar.

The univerſities, beyond all doubt are the propereſt places for the reception of ſuch recovered brethren as come over to us, particularly eccleſiaſtics. But the queſtion will be, how to diſpoſe of them when there? Upon ſeveral accounts it might be inconvenient to have them diſtributed in different colleges. The repoſe of our preſent Gremials would be leſs diſturbed, and the ends of ſuch a charity every way better anſwered by placing theſe converts, foreign or domeſtic, in a diſtinct ſociety, where, under the government of a ſenſible head, and a few aſſiſtants taken from among the preſent members of our univerſities, and encouraged by adequate emoluments, both the bodily neceſſities, and the intellectual improvement of theſe new gueſts might be moſt happily provided for. But where ſhall a fabric be found, whence ſhall an endowment ariſe ſufficient to anſwer the purpoſes of ſuch an inſtitution to the extent in which it may be neceſſary to provide for them? I anſwer on the part of Cambridge, without heſitation—DOWNING COLLEGE, which has been ſo long a bone of contention, and the deſignation of which, we are now told, muſt after all depend upon a royal charter. Every one who makes uſe of his eyes muſt ſee, that we have already more colleges than *are* filled. Every one who reflects on the train we are in, muſt be ſenſible we have more than are *likely* to be filled. And perhaps, we have already as many as the ne-

neceſſities of the public would have occaſion for, if they *were* filled, and every member, of every ſociety among us, ſhould completely anſwer the ends for which a liberal education is ſuppoſed to be intended. I am humbly of opinion that no public foundation which the munificent ſpirit of the preſent age hath carried into execution, hath met with more approbation, than the appropriation of DOWNING COLLEGE for the reception and ſubſiſtence of clerical converts from the church of Rome would deſerve from all true friends of the proteſtant religion, and from all who deſire that the bleſſings of it ſhould be tranſmitted to our lateſt poſterity.

Yours, &c.

An Academical Viſionary.

To the PRINTER.

SIR, *July* 15, 1766.

THERE is nothing ſo provoking, becauſe nothing is ſo dreadful to men who are working iniquity in the dark, as to have the light let in ſuddenly upon them, and all their machinery as well as the operators themſelves expoſed to public view. Whatever obſtructions they may meet with in their *caverns*, the diſappointment, while the men

men themſelves are under cover, may, at the worſt, be but *temporary*. Perſeverance, and a return of favourable circumſtances, may ſet all right, and enable them, at ſome future opportunity, to ſpring their mine with the deſired ſucceſs. But when the workmen themſelves, as well as their employment, are known and marked, it is not eaſy to ſay how long the vigilance of thoſe concerned to guard againſt them may keep their labours in a ſtate of ſuſpence; perhaps, retard the fruits of them, for a whole generation to come.

In this moſt cruel ſituation is *The Friend to Truth* and his crew. (—THE *Friend to Truth*, as he *now* calls himſelf, by way of eminence I ſuppoſe, and in excluſion of all others.) The plain caſe is this. Some time ago large cargoes of popiſh emiſſaries were imported into this kingdom from the coaſts of France and Flanders. This was noted by the public, not without ſome extremely probable conjectures concerning the encouragement they had to make this migration at that particular juncture. Still theſe were *but* conjectures. Within a while their numbers viſibly diminiſhed, and except a chozen band, who were left to watch incidents, and to have an eye to the common intereſt, (and among them, moſt probably, this very *Friend to Truth*) the reſt diſappeared, and were no longer ſeen upon Britiſh ground.

Not long after this retreat, intelligence arrived from an honeſt worthy Traveller, a true friend to his King and country, which accounted for the late motions of theſe zealots, in a manner that left no room for doubt or uncertainty. His ſtation

enabled him to make the moſt explicit diſcoveries. He accordingly laid open the whole myſtery, explained the motives of their flocking to England at *one* particular period, and of their remigration at *another*; and, what was ſtill more unlucky for their friends in Britain, he gave an authentic liſt of their forces, ſhewing at the ſame time by what particular diſcipline they were kept in practice, and prepared to act as occaſion ſhould ſerve.

Had this Gentleman been ſilent, the public jealouſy perhaps might have been laid aſleep. The enemy was retreated to his own quarters, and what he did there, few would have enquired. In the mean time, their old friend might find the means to reſtore his former coadjutors, or to ſupply others ſtill better affected to the cauſe than they; either of which events would, of courſe, create a demand of more money and a ſecond *miſſion*. But the mine being thus laid open by our faithful and well-informed watchman, and the attention of the public turned upon the horrid ſcenery of theſe dark-working craftſmen, it is to be hoped that our future caution will be increaſed in proportion to the rage and reſentment theſe men expreſs againſt the author of this diſcovery, by the pen of this moſt able, moſt candid, and moſt ſincere *Friend to Truth*.

It hath been obſerved, and ſometimes complained of, that the moſt infamous and notorious criminals have not only ſomething to alledge for themſelves, but that, by the dint of money, they often find ſome body of a more reſpectable character to alledge it for them. But I dare anſwer for the papiſts

papiſts on this occaſion, that they have been at no ſuch expence. They have found an advocate in this *Friend to Truth* in their own body, and that too at a pinch, when every other ſort of man would have given up their cauſe as deſperate.

Well then, what has he had to ſay to our friendly Traveller? He is at a loſs, it ſeems, to find out *my* country; but I am under no difficulty to diſcover *his*. He is manifeſtly couſin German to poor *Teague* of *Tipperary*, who being aſked, upon his trial at the *Old Bailey*, what he had to ſay to the facts laid to his charge, anſwered, *Now upon my ſhalvaſhon, dear honeys, it iſh all a vherry idle ſhtory, for aſh I am a leeving chreſhtian, the evidenſh haſh ſaid nothing but what my ſhelf, and my looving couſhin* O Crone *knew long ſhinſh.*

But being reminded of his blunder, he hath taken leave, in this *ſecond* eſſay, to amend his anſwer, and the Traveller's report, inſtead of being, as it was in the *firſt*, a notorious truth, is NOW *The reverſe of truth, ſubſtituted for reaſons of ſtate.*

How happy are the late miniſtry in ſuch a patron, whether one conſiders his penetration, his dexterity, his talents, or his management of them!

I ſhall now proceed to his evidence of the Pretender's courage, but as the croſs-examination of his witneſſes, will run out into ſome length, I muſt reſerve that for another letter, which ſhall not be long out of your hands, if you will pleaſe to receive it.

I ſhall ſay nothing to his buffoonry. It is a commodious cover for the ferment of a diſquieted ſpirit. It would indeed be a thouſand pities on ano-

another account to diſrobe him of his fools cap and his patch'd coat. If he were not to be indulged in a little comical horſe-play, which paſſes with ſome folks for *wit*, he would be in the utmoſt danger of ranking with the NUMBSCULLS of his party. I am,

SIR, &c.

PHILODITES.

The END *of the* FIRST VOLUME.

ERRATUM.—Page 39, at the bottom, *read*

* Rarus enim fermè ſenſus communis in illâ Fortunâ.